

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^O. X. JANUARY 1878.

ART. I.—THE ANGLICAN FORM OF ORDINATION.

1. *The Question of Anglican Ordinations Discussed.* By E. E. ESTCOURT, M.A., Canon of S. Chad's Cathedral, Birmingham. (London, 1873.)
2. *Anglican Orders. A few Remarks in the form of a Conversation on the recent work by Canon ESTCOURT.* (London, 1873.)
3. *The Validity of Anglican Orders Examined.* By the Very Rev. P. R. KENRICK. (Philadelphia, 1841.)
4. *The Ordinal of King Edward VI.* By Dom WILFRID RAYNAL, O.S.B. (London, 1871.)
5. *Shall we alter the Ordinal? A Paper originally submitted to the Revision Committee of the Church of Ireland.* By CHAS. PARSONS REICHEL, D.D., Archdeacon of Meath. (Dublin, 1872.)
6. *Quarterly Review*, October 1877. Art. 'Ordination and Confession.'

THE works above named come from very different quarters, and agree only in this, that they are attacks upon the Form of Anglican Ordination. The pamphlet of Archdeacon Reichel assails it from the Protestant side. The gist of his argument is this: that the sentence which we use for the Ordination of Priests does not appear to have been so applied in the Primitive Church or in any Ordinal up to the twelfth century, and that it was then adopted because of the countenance which the words 'whosoever sins thou dost remit they are remitted

VOL. V.—NO. X.

T

unto them' were calculated to give to the mediæval practice of confession. The English divines, who adopted this form for the Ordinal in the reign of Edward VI., did so, he imagines, under an erroneous impression derived from the schoolmen that this use of the words was primitive, and that they were necessary to valid Ordination: if they had possessed the information concerning the ancient Ordinals which the researches of Morinus made known, it may be supposed they would not have made such a selection at all. And should we now alter them we should, according to the Archdeacon, only be doing what the Reformers would have done had they possessed our knowledge. These arguments have been replied to in Ireland, and have there failed in effecting the change at which they aimed. And it would be quite unnecessary for us to refer to them now if it were not that, to our great surprise, they have made their appearance on this side the water exactly in their old form, and evidently also with their old object, of preparing the way for a revision of the Ordinal, although the circumstances of the Church of England do not permit so explicit a statement of that purpose as we find in the Irish pamphlet.

But this supposed Romish origin of our sentence of Ordination by no means conciliates to it the approval of Romish writers. On the contrary, the work of Canon Estcourt is an elaborate indictment of the validity of our form. Some of his co-religionists appear, if we may judge from the Conversation above named, to be far from easy as to the soundness of his reasoning, and prefer to cling to the old Nag's Head story or to the imagination that Barlow was unconsecrated. But in fact his work shows very plainly that the personal succession of our bishops cannot be impugned save by a captious historical criticism under which the Apostolic succession of any See in Christendom must be declared unproven.¹ The only hope which Rome possesses of invalidating our claim to the possession of a true priesthood lies in objections against the form of our Ordinations.

To this question of form then we apply ourselves. He is

¹ It is not remarked either by Canon Estcourt or his critic that the Irish succession is not subject even to those poor objections which the Nag's Head story and the cavils regarding Bishop Barlow furnish to the English. Even if all Dr. Brady's arguments were allowed to be well founded, the Irish succession through Archbishop Curwen, consecrated in 1555, is unimpugned. See the *Irish Reformation*, by W. M. Brady, D.D., 5th ed., p. 187.

widely mistaken who supposes that an inquiry into form in the sense in which we here use the word concerns anything formal, minute, or merely fitted for theologians. The very reverse is the case. All being agreed that laying on of hands is the action necessary in Ordination, reason and common-sense require that the action should be accompanied by some words expressing an intelligent appreciation of its meaning. The Lord has given all His gifts and instructions to reasoning beings and not to machines. And it would be formal and mechanical in the extreme to contend that the mere doing of a certain act made a priest unless some words at the same time expressed a sense of what a priest is, and how he is made, and an intention of using the action with this sense and meaning. This is but the same principle which prevails in arranging all the forms of procedure in State affairs and in the law.

Following out the same line of thought, we are bound to allow that words which constitute a valid form when used in a certain sense may yet be invalid if used in a different sense. If the king were in mere joke to use a word which purported to endow a man with some dignity or office, it would be an extreme of formalism to argue that the office or dignity was thus really conferred. And even if this were allowed in secular affairs, which deal only with the outward life, the same principle could not be extended to a proceeding so essentially spiritual as the making of bishops or priests. At the same time reason demands that where a form is used which is under any circumstances allowed to be valid, a strong presumption should be allowed in its favour, and very weighty arguments demanded of any one who impugns it.

It is of course necessary that we should defend the validity of the form, both in the state in which it was used for a century after 1549 and in its present condition. But let us observe at the outset in what sense we call the Sentences of Ordination the Form at all. We shall see that prayer and the laying on of hands were, according to all ancient precedent, the sole requisites. These sentences, then, not being strictly precatory, cannot, by themselves, be called the forms of Ordination in that sense in which the word is used when it is said that the form together with the matter make the sacrament. But it is highly reasonable to regard these sentences in combination with the prayer which has preceded. There has been prayer in the 'Veni Creator;' prayer by the consecrating or ordaining bishops for those 'called to the office of priesthood,' or 'called to the work and ministry of a bishop;' prayer in the

silent supplications asked from all present ; and in the collects which immediately precede the laying on of hands ; and the sentences conclude the prayers and furnish additional evidence as to what the Church meant in them and with what amount of certainty she looked for an answer. Thus these sentences are a very important part of the form and, had they been different from what they are, would have given a wholly different meaning to the whole transaction.

The author of Holy Orders is God : and the laying on of hands signifies the communication of His Grace for the purpose of conferring them. It is natural, therefore, that prayer acknowledging the Divine source of the grace which is sought, and claiming it, should be, with imposition of hands, the essential requisite for a valid form. And so we find it in every Ordinal and in every historical record of Ordinations through every period of Christian history. Prayer and the laying on of hands are the essentials of the rite. Now, in the most ancient forms which we possess, the prayer accompanies the laying on of hands, and its words have then a double aspect. They are in the first place an address to God demanding of Him the grace, and in the second place they have, as regards the person ordained, a sacramental character, sealing or conveying to him the grace which is sought for, and which it is known God has covenanted to grant. And this is not at all unnatural. It is in fact the form in which every benediction runs. The words, 'The Lord bless you,' and all the numberless variations in which the same idea is expressed, involve both an address to God in prayer and an address to men in blessing. But though this be quite natural, yet it is plain the character of the transaction would be more clearly brought out by the utterance of a prayer to God in the first place and then the use during the imposition of hands of some words which, directly addressed to the person ordained, should be fitted to make him conscious of the powers and duties which are being imparted to him. Thus our form runs. And in the New Testament (Acts xiii. 3) the prayer seems to have distinctly preceded the laying on of hands ; the words by which the imposition was accompanied, if any such they were, have not been preserved to us.

One can see the operation of this obvious way of reasoning, though clumsily applied, in the different parts of the *Roman Pontifical*. First we have a silent imposition of hands ; in continuation of this an extension of hands over the heads of the ordinands, accompanied by a prayer. And this, beyond doubt, is the most ancient part of the office, and by

this imposition of hands and prayer the best authorities in the Roman Church agree that the priest is ordained.¹ But after this, the delivery of the vessels, with power to offer sacrifices, has been added; at which point the rubric of the Pontifical begins to call the candidates *ordinati* instead of *ordinandi*. But still further on come the words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum remiseris peccata remittuntur eis, et quorum retinueris retenta sunt*, accompanied by another imposition of hands. Now this Ordinal has plainly come to be what it is in the course of ages by a very natural process of aggregation, but without any care to incorporate the successive additions so as to make a consistent whole. If the moderns be right that the second (better called, the first) imposition makes the priest, it is nothing less than a denial of her own orders by the Church of Rome, that she should afterwards call him *ordinandus*. However, he is certainly made a priest *either* by this second imposition *or* by the delivery of the vessels, as Eugenius IV., in his *Epistle to the Armenians* (very erroneously, in spite of his infallibility), laid down; an opinion which the rubric reflects. At all events, the priest being, by one or other of these acts fully made, has received all the powers of the priesthood, and it is utterly anomalous to use the words which are meant to endow him with those powers at a period of the service so very much later as that at which the *Accipe* occurs. The whole form for ordaining priests in the *Roman Pontifical* is in the very utmost confusion: full of beautiful elements thrown together with a want of harmony and arrangement which actually involves serious doctrinal misstatement. And Dr. Döllinger at Bonn was very well justified in quoting to Roman impugnors of Anglican Orders the proverb, 'They who live in a glass house should not throw stones.'

Such as it is, however, the form came into the hands of the schoolmen imposed by an authority from which there was no appeal, and, making the best of it, they wove their theories about it: theories so various and inconsistent as to attract the derision of the Protestants, who mocked them for not being able to discover how the priest was made.² But we must not confound their theories as to how the priest is made under their own Pontifical with their conception of what is absolutely necessary under all circumstances for the making of a priest. Archdeacon Reichel has convinced himself that

¹ Perrone, *Praelect. Theol.* Ed. Migne, ii. p. 480; Scavini, *Theol. Mor.* iv. p. 351; Kenrick, *Ang. Ord.* p. 182, note.

² Tyndale, *Doctrinal Treatises.* Par. Soc. ed. p. 258.

there was so strong a body of opinion among the schoolmen in favour of the doctrine that a priest was made by the repetition of the words of S. John xx. 23, that it may have been expected to influence the Reformers even after these had broken with well nigh every other Roman belief. But in the first place he does not make it clear that anybody held such a theory without being also possessed by the preconception that, as this was the form enjoined by the Church of Rome, all were bound to adopt it. Now, if what the schoolmen meant by their assertion of the effect of the words of S. John xx. 23, in Ordination, was its effect under the Roman form, and because enjoined by the authority of the Roman Church, their theory cannot be supposed to have had the least influence on our Reformers, who had cast off all regard for that authority. Again, Archdeacon Reichel is mistaken in supposing that Bellarmine asserts Ordination to be effected by the repetition of these words alone. His doctrine is quite different; namely, that it is effected *by the two acts* of delivering the vessels and reciting the Lord's words with imposition of hands. Now a belief that Ordination is effected by the two forms cannot reasonably be supposed to have had a constraining influence in favour of retaining one of these, the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, upon persons who were utterly casting away the other supposed essential (in which, as a glance at the rubrics must have shown them, the real force was supposed to lie), namely, the delivery of the instruments.

The decree of the Council of Trent, when fairly considered, does not go even so far as Bellarmine. It merely anathematizes those who say that the *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum* is said in vain. But this is quite as consistent with the supposition that the words express the nature and power of the Orders previously conferred, as that they are supposed to confer the Orders.¹ Accordingly, the approved opinion among Roman theologians, even so extreme as Alphonsus Liguori, is that Orders are conferred during the second laying on of hands before either the *porrectio instrumentorum* or the *Accipe*. They could not entertain such an opinion if the Council of Trent had decided otherwise. And the *Acta Genuina* of the Council, as published by Theiner,² afford proof that the wording of the decree was deliberately adopted to avoid pledging the Council to any theory on the subject. For there we find that drafts of decrees were proposed, which should declare, 'Si quis dixerit unctionem *non requiri* in sacramenti ordinis traditione,

¹ See Kenrick, *Ang. Ord.* p. 178.

² Vol. i. p. 646; see also vol. ii. p. 152.

anathema sit:’ and ‘si quis dixerit episcopum, *dum ordinat*, frustra dicere, Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, anathema sit.’ The decrees as passed contain no assertion that unction is required, nor that the bishop says the *Accipe* while he is ordaining; for they run, ‘Si quis dixerit frustra episcopos dicere, Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,’ and ‘si quis dixerit sacram unctionem, quâ Ecclesia in sanctâ ordinatione utitur, non tantum non requirere sed contemnendam et perniciosam esse, anathema sit.’ And, indeed, it would be strange if the Council had been without the knowledge that neither ceremony was essential; for not only had it among its members Salmeron, whom Mason quotes as fully acquainted with the Greek methods of Ordination, but the Greek Ordinals, which, containing neither ceremony, were yet universally recognised as valid, had been printed at Venice (not so far from Trent) in four or five editions before the Council met.¹ It would be simply ludicrous to imagine the English Reformers to have been more under the dominion of the schoolmen than the Council of Trent itself.

What reason does the Archdeacon offer us for so strange an opinion? We really can discover none, except a passage from a sermon of Bishop Andrewes, and a general description by Morinus, of the condition of ignorance on the matter, under which a large number of writers laboured before his researches were made. Andrewes says that by the words ‘Receive the Holy Ghost, Holy Orders were given to the Apostles, and are by the same words given to us at the present day; which words if the Church of Rome had not retained, her priesthood might have been doubted.’² But probably Andrewes was only speaking of the omission of Scripture principles which there would have been in the Roman Ordinal had these words been left out; certainly, he is not accepting the authority of schoolmen, but is judging them and their Church by Scripture. We can hardly suppose him, of all men, to have either intended to condemn Eastern Orders or been ignorant how they were conferred. But if he was thus strangely ignorant, it is absurd to argue from his case to that of the Reformers, when there was between them this great difference, to mention no other, that while he doubtless admitted no Orders but Episcopal, most of them either recognised foreign Protestant Orders, conferred without these words at all, or, at least, were quite familiar from their intercourse with foreigners with the idea of dispensing with them.

¹ The early publication of the Greek Ordinals was brought out in a letter of the Rev. Professor Gibbins to a Dublin paper, Dec. 4, 1872.

² Sermons, vol. iii. p. 267. *Ang. Cat. Lib. Ed.*

Mason, a contemporary of Andrewes, not only quotes Salmeron for the fact that Greek Orders were conferred by a precatory form, but himself lays down, in a work published thirty years before that of Morinus, the clearest principles concerning the requisites for valid form. 'Christ, through His Apostles, ordained that ministers should be appointed in His Church, for Christ speaks in His Apostles. But to ordain ministers is nothing else but to commit to them ministerial power, which cannot be done without fitting words. Wherefore, while Christ, through His Apostles, gave it in command that ministers should be appointed, He commanded also, though implicitly, that during Ordination fit words should be used, *i.e.* words which should include the power of the orders then conferred.' 'Shall we say, then,' he asks, 'that there can be different essential forms for conferring the same order?' 'In words,' he replies, 'two things are to be regarded, the sound and the sense; difference of sound does not constitute difference of essential forms when the very same sense underlies them. What, then, is the sense which is required for the essential form of Ordination? that by which the whole power of that Order is conferred, which, however, may lie hid under different forms of words.'¹ In the preceding generation, we find Whitgift declaring that the Ordinal is 'almost in no point correspondent to the Pope's Pontifical.' But more important still are the opinions (printed in Burnet² and Collier) of the divines who, in 1540, were appointed to draw up the 'Necessary Doctrine and Erudition.' There the query is proposed, 'whether in the New Testament be required any consecration of a bishop and priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient.' Fifteen opinions of bishops and divines are given, all treating of the requisites for Orders. There is not a whisper of the opinion which Archdeacon Reichel supposes so widespread. One we shall give, because it came from Hethe, Bishop of Rochester, who was so far from being a vehement Protestant, that he afterwards refused to accept the Ordinal. 'The Scripture speaketh de impositione manûs et de oratione, and of other manner of consecrations I find no mention in the New Testament expressly; but the old authors make mention also of inunctions.'

As for Morinus, it would be quite absurd to be guided by his authority as to the belief of the English Reformers a hundred years before. But even he does not record any universal opinion in favour of the necessity of the words, but

¹ *Vindiciæ Eccl. Ang.* 1625, pp. 220, 221.

² *Records*, Part I. B. iii. No. 21.

only a doctrine of that nature held by 'most of the schoolmen,' which, as he points out, the Church herself cannot have shared, since she did not re-ordain Greek priests on joining her.

Never, we are persuaded, was a more baseless theory propounded, nor one displaying a more profound ignorance of the state of belief among the Reformers, than that by which Archdeacon Reichel would persuade us that the Ordinal was composed under a misconception, and on which he would ground a motion for altering it.

The genuine history of the composition of our form introduces us to a condition of thought as wide apart as the poles from that in which Archdeacon Reichel supposes it to have originated, and to society in which it is ridiculous to mention the theories of the schoolmen. In fact, we should advise nobody to study the real history of this matter who has not nerve enough to recognise how close the Church of England lay in those days to mere Protestantism. But whoever, in observing the care which in many dangers God took for the Catholic truth which our Church preserves, can find compensations for the presence in her history of objectionable elements may find abundant interest in the history of the Ordinal. In the winter of the year 1549, we find that a Committee was appointed to prepare an Ordinal against the ensuing April 1. Now on April 25 of that same year 1549, Martin Bucer had reached England from Strasburg. It is very well known that Bucer exercised a very injurious influence upon the Prayer-Book of 1552. But little or no notice has been taken of the important work which we find, under the title *de ordinatione legitimâ ministrorum ecclesiæ revocandâ*, at p. 238 of his *Scripta Anglicana*. The most cursory perusal of this work will prove its relationship to our Ordinal. The selections of Scripture to be read are very nearly identical with those used in our three forms. The beautiful exhortation in our Ordinal of Priests stands unmistakeably, though in a poor Latin style, in Bucer's work. The questions put to the ordinands are in many cases identical, and of many of the prayers the same may be said. But Bucer's form is only one for all the three Orders. The sentence of Ordination is the same whether it is a bishop, priest, or deacon that is being ordained, viz. 'The

¹ Basel, 1577. The chief portions will be found printed side by side with the corresponding parts of our Ordinal in one of the pamphlets produced by the Irish Revision agitation: *We ought not to alter the Ordinal*. By Rev. R. Travers Smith. Dublin: Hodges and Foster. 1872.

hand of God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost be upon you, protect and govern you, that ye may go and bring forth much fruit by your ministry, and that it may remain unto life eternal.' But he adds at the conclusion an account of an attempt (of a quite illusory character) to keep up the appearance of episcopacy in a church really Presbyterian; proposing this apparently as a model for the Church of England:—

'Since there are three orders of presbyters and guardians of the Church: the order of bishops, then that of presbyters, whom the ancients called cardinals, who carry on the chief government of the Church in places where there are no bishops; and then that of those presbyters who help the former and are called among us deacons or helpers; thus also ordination is graduated; that when any one is ordained a superintendent, *i.e.* bishop, all things may be done and accomplished somewhat more fully and solemnly than when a presbyter of the second or third order is ordained. So also there is made some difference between the ordination of presbyters of the second and third orders.'

Now, regarding this work, only two theories are possible. Either it was the Ordinal of 1549 translated into Latin (as the Prayer-Book was) for the information of Bucer, who did not know English, and by him altered and welded into one form and proposed as a 'reduction of episcopacy' for the Revision of 1552, or else it was an original draft for the Ordinal of 1549; either drawn up by Bucer himself as an account of the arrangements in his church of Strasburg and proposed as a model for England, or an alteration by him of some draft by Cranmer or some other of the Committee. Various indications, which we have not space to recount, incline us to the first form of the latter alternative. We hold that the document was a draft for the Ordinal of 1549, and moreover, that it is the original work of Bucer himself. But for the purpose which we have at present in hand, it does not make much difference which of these theories we adopt. *Either* the Reformers in 1549 composed their Ordinal on the basis of a draft by Bucer altered by them, *or* the Reformers in 1552 rejected certain proposals by Bucer for an alteration of the Ordinal of 1549.

Now the relation which the English form bears to Bucer's is this. His vague proposal for a certain difference of solemnity in the application of the common form to one or other of the three Orders expands into a separate and distinct office for each. The Psalms and passages of the Bible which are suggested by him are distributed with strict discrimi-

nation among the three forms. His prayers and questions are, with the necessary corrections, used so far as they would go; but others are added where required for a threefold form. Above all, his one poor and perfectly inadequate sentence of Ordination vanishes altogether, and three distinct ones of the utmost force and definiteness appear in its place. Of course Archdeacon Reichel eagerly remarks here that the Reformers, while adopting so much of Bucer's draft, wandered from it in the sentence of Ordination, under the influence of those theories of the schoolmen which he attributes to them. It is not just to make this observation without observing that they made this alteration of Bucer's work only as a part of the whole process of making three forms out of his one, and that they could not have taken his words except by giving up episcopacy. Moreover, in the form for bishops and in that for deacons, they did not resort to the Pontifical. Whether, then, is it more likely that they went to the Pontifical or to Scripture direct for the sentence for priests? The considerations we have already urged make it to the last degree unlikely that they were influenced by the example of the Roman form. It is unnecessary to suppose even that the schoolmen directed them, as Canon Estcourt imagines, to the selection of imperative rather than precatory forms. A wholly different reason for their selection is discoverable: a reason which we believe to be of the greatest importance in the whole controversy.

The preface to the Ordinal states it to be evident to all men *reading Holy Scripture* . . . that from the Apostles' time there hath been these orders of ministers in the Christian Church, bishops, priests, and deacons.¹ Now, in reference to the testimony of Scripture, it has been a belief at all times maintained by many of the most learned and orthodox writers in every part of the Church, that the order of the priesthood succeeds to the original mission of the Apostles as the messengers of the Lord to dispense His word and sacraments; while the bishops succeed to that office to which, in the development of the Apostolic Church, we find Timothy and Titus raised as successors of the Apostles in their supreme government. How far the Church of Rome herself has been from disallowing such a view, may be judged by any one who will read the debates of the Council of Trent upon the subject, or the chapter devoted by Morinus¹ to the various opinions on the distinction between bishops and

¹ *Sac. Ord.* iii. pp. 37-39.

priests. In accordance with this exposition, the sentence of Ordination for Priests in the Ordinal of 1549, consists of the words which the Lord addressed to His Apostles, 'Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins thou dost forgive they are forgiven, whose sins thou dost retain they are retained,' followed by the admonition, 'Be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacraments.' In the consecration of a bishop, the first words are, 'Take the Holy Ghost;' but that these words are not extracted from the verse in S. John is testified by the very substitution of *take* for *receive*. 'Take the Holy Ghost' is set down in order to provide a basis for the reference contained in the words which follow, 'and remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is in thee by imposition of hands: for God hath not given us the spirit of fear but of power, and of love and of a sound mind.' These words are taken from 2 Tim. i. 6-7.

The reason, then, of the selection of the sentences of Ordination in 1549 we believe to have been *purely Scriptural*. They amounted to this, that whatever the Lord meant to impart to His Apostles by the words recorded by S. John, that the Church desired to impart to her priests; and whatever the grace which was given to Timothy by the laying on of the Apostles' hands, that the Church desired to give to her bishops, and bid them in the Apostle's words to stir it up.

These forms were altered at the last review by the insertion of the words, 'for the office and work of a priest now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands,' and 'for the office and work of a bishop in the Church of God now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands,' the word 'take' being also changed to 'receive.' And it is highly significant that at the same time a change was made in the portions of Scripture appointed for the Epistles and Gospels in the Ordinal for priests and bishops respectively. In 1549 the Epistle in the Ordinal for priests was either the passage from Acts xx., in which S. Paul addresses the elders of Ephesus whom the Holy Ghost has made overseers, or else a portion of 1 Tim. iii., which says that if any man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work. In 1662 these passages are both transferred to the Consecration of Bishops. In 1549 one of the alternative Gospels for the ordination of priests was the concluding portion of S. Matthew, in which the Lord says to His Apostles, 'Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.' In 1662 this passage appears as one of the

alternative Gospels for the consecration of bishops, while another of them is furnished by the words from S. John xx., which in 1549 provided the sentence of Ordination for priests. It seems, then, abundantly plain that, although the revisers of 1662 did not so alter the sentences of Ordination as to expunge the original idea, yet a different theory prevailed with them as to the manner in which the Orders of bishops and priests are discoverable in Scripture, and of the texts which refer respectively to each. We rather think that the expositions of 1549 are those which would find favour with most critics of the present day. But we shall not enter upon that question. The correctness or incorrectness with which the passages of Scripture were expounded could never be supposed to influence the validity of the Ordination. That may depend upon the intention with which the Church uses the words, but certainly not upon the correctness of her Biblical criticism.

Now, it would be quite possible to hold the belief that in the mission of Timothy by S. Paul we find the source and precedent of the episcopal office, and at the same time to conceive that the 'laying on of my hands' mentioned in 2 Tim. i. 6-7, was that by which Timothy was ordained *presbyter*. But much more is it certain that any who considered that laying on of hands to have been a special one which took place when Timothy was raised to the office he was then holding in Ephesus, must see episcopacy as a distinct order in the office which he filled. But this is precisely what the Reformers must have believed. For they direct a laying of hands on those who, having been already presbyters, are now to be made bishops, and they use the words from 2 Tim. in direct reference to this. And if any doubt is still possible as to the exposition of Scripture which suggested the selection of these sentences, it will be set at rest by reading the explanation of the two passages in the paraphrase of Erasmus. Now, just at the time of the composition of the Ordinal that work was a kind of authorised document in the English Church, having been translated in 1547 and 1549, and ordered to be set up in every parish church in England for popular use. And S. John xx. 23 is thus paraphrased by Erasmus: 'Simul cum dicto insufflavimus in faciem illorum impartitus Spiritum, addidit auctoritatem remittendi peccata cunctis hominibus qui per evangelicam professionem ac baptismum sibi jungerentur perque vitæ prioris pœnitudinem vere resipiscerent.' And 2 Tim. i. 6-7 is in the same work explained as follows: 'Donum Dei quod per imposi-

tionem manuum mearum *episcopus ordinatus* accepisti suscites tuâ industriâ vigilantiaque fortique et infracto animo peragas tibi delegatum munus.'

This reference to the Paraphrase of Erasmus will be found, we are convinced, of much importance as showing the intention with which these sentences of Scripture were chosen; nor this alone, but also as furnishing us with an exposition of the particular sense in which they were intended to be taken. Let any one consider how exactly contemporaneous with the composition of the Ordinal was the sanction given by the Church to the Paraphrase, and how unreserved that sanction was, and he will be convinced that if Cranmer himself could have been asked what he meant by the words of the Ordinal he would have replied in the words of the Paraphrase. Now let us remember that the Paraphrase was not a Protestant work. In the words of Professor Blunt,¹ 'having been executed by a member of the Church of Rome, from whose eyes, however, the scales were fast falling, it was calculated, he (Cranmer) might think (and an expression which drops from him confirms this) for a Church in a state of transition like our own. Had Gardiner compared it with similar writings of some other of the Reformers he would have found that in making such a choice, Cranmer, so far from intending to irritate, could only be led by a desire to conciliate the Roman Catholics as much as might be without a compromise.' And these observations upon Cranmer's intention in setting forth the Paraphrase may, with precisely the same justice, be made as to his intention in applying, so exactly according to the principles of the Paraphrase, the passages of Scripture which he used in the Ordinal.

We should, however, be mistaken if we supposed that Cranmer was likely to meet, so far at all events as the sentence for ordaining priests was concerned, with any opposition to his explanation, even from the most ultra-Protestant reformer with whom he was at the time in contact. We find in the *Scripta Anglicana* of Bucer (p. 592), a work upon the 'Power and Use of the Sacred Ministry.' There the words of S. John xx. 22-3 are expounded as follows: 'Another place to which I desire to call your attention is that in John xx. "As my Father sent Me, even so send I you;" and "He said, Receive the Holy Ghost: whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted," &c. He does not say "to whomsoever ye shall announce that their sins are forgiven," but "whosoever sins ye, ye shall remit." Observe to what a

¹ Quoted by Mr. Pennington, *Life of Erasmus*, p. 199.

dignity He raises His ministers; for it is the part of God alone to remit to men their sins, even as it is the part of any individual man (his part is such a sense that it cannot be done by any one else) to remit any injury done against himself, and to reconcile his mind to the person who has inflicted it. But God wishes to exhibit His grace and His remission of sins to His children through His ministers, and all those ministries which He has ordained for this purpose; for by baptism the children of God are washed from their sins, and that washing, and the remission of all sins afterwards committed, is confirmed and exhibited in the Eucharist, in Absolution, and in every ministration of the Gospel and of holy prayers.'

Had Cranmer been pressed with the notable argument, that the Lord's words are addressed, not to individuals in the singular as the words of our Ordinal, but to the Apostles in general, he would doubtless have replied that it was impossible to explain how this general commission could be real without extending to each Apostle, or how it was to be suspended all the time they were going separately into all the world, and only to become active if they happened (as was never the case) all to come together again. If he had been plied with the often-quoted remark of Dr. Pusey, that so long as these words were repeated over priests when ordained, so long there would be confession in the Church of England, he would probably have answered that, in the first place, it was neither his wish nor intention to bring about a state of things in which there should be no confession in the Church of England, but only to abolish the obligation to confess, and the unnecessary minuteness which had been usual in the ordinance; and in the next place, that so long as the words stood in the Bible as Christ's commission to His ministers, so long would they, and any practical consequence fairly derivable from them, be applicable to all validly ordained ministers whatever the form used in their ordination.

We seem now to be in a position to consider the Roman Catholic criticisms upon the validity of our forms. And here we are met in the outset by an admission which might well seem to be decisive. In the year 1704 the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition was asked to decide upon the validity of the Ordinations of the schismatic Church of Abyssinia, where Orders were wont to be conferred after the following well-nigh incredible fashion. The archbishop would hold no ordinations until eight or ten thousand candidates were assembled in the city where he resided. It was then necessary for him to ordain

them at the rate of three or four thousand a day. They who were to receive the priesthood were arranged in ranks in the church, and 'the archbishop passing hastily in front of them imposes his hands on the head of each saying "Accipe Spiritum Sanctum." And in consequence of the great multitude, the confusion, and the haste, the archbishop on some does not impose his hands at all, and in other cases does not pronounce the words of the form.' The question was whether priests are validly ordained in such a form, and ought, therefore, on being purged from their schism, to be admitted to the exercise of their office in the Roman Church. And the answer of the Congregation was that the form was to be treated as valid for all who could remember that the hands had been placed on their heads, and the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost' spoken.¹ The meaning and intention of the words were supposed to have been sufficiently defined by the general faith and doctrine of the Abyssinian Church as expressed by certain sacred books of theirs, which, in fact, were not used in Ordinations at all.²

The decision seems very strange when we remember that prayer is according to all antiquity the essential part of the form, and that in these ordinations there is no sign of any prayer whatever. But passing over this, we make the obvious remark, that as the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost' are used in our Ordinal, there seems no good reason why Roman Catholics should, on their own principles, any longer dispute the validity of our forms. This very obvious remark having been made by others, a 'doubt' upon the question whether imposition of hands with the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost,' is enough to confer priests' orders, was submitted a short time ago by Cardinal Manning to the Congregation of the Inquisition, and the reply was communicated in a letter of Cardinal Patrizi, which was printed in the *Month* for July 1875. It was to the following effect. In the first place it states that the decision of the Congregation in 1704 was not formally a decree. On which we remark that we have here a curious instance of the practical working of Papal infallibility: an instance exactly parallel to the case of the condemnation of Galileo. A question comes before the infallible tribunal; a reply is given by which the faithful guide their souls even in things which (like the validity of Orders) may be vital to salvation, on the understanding that they have received an infallible direction. But when some inconvenience or error becomes apparent in the practical application of the decision,

¹ Estcourt, p. 190.

² *Ib.* p. 243.

then it is discovered that something was wanting in its form, which deprives it of that infallible character which all had supposed it to possess. Such an infallibility seems to be singularly formed for leading people into obstinate error.

But, in the next place, the Congregation intimates that the rite of Ordination, as it is found in the sacred books of the Abyssinians, shows that the words 'Receive the Holy Ghost' do not constitute their whole form, and that therefore the decision is not to be understood as implying that these words suffice. Now anybody who will read the statement submitted to the Congregation in 1704, as given in Canon Estcourt's book (pp. 190 and App. xxxiv.), will observe that in his own words, 'in the case laid before the Sacred Congregation it is not stated that any prayers whatever are said, or any other words than the mere *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*.' He proceeds, it is true, to observe that the faith and doctrine of the Abyssinian Church are expressed by the unused part of the form. But it is certainly a strange principle and scarcely consistent even with the Roman doctrine of intention that the meaning and effect of words used should be determined by other words which are not used; which are very probably quite unknown to everybody concerned; and by the non-use of which the ordaining bishop deprives himself of all claim to be intending to do what his Church intended to do when she composed the form which he neglects. The answer, however, of the Sacred Congregation proceeds not on the ground that the mind of the Abyssinian Church in general is thus declared by the unused ancient rite, but on the ground that the ancient rite is *part of the same form* which contains what is actually used; 'those words *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*,' say they, 'do not constitute the *entire form*.' In this they are absolutely mistaken; 'for,' says Mons. Bel, in a letter to Canon Estcourt, 'how these words, *which are nowhere to be found in the Coptic rite*, were introduced into their rite, escapes our knowledge;' and the form given by the same authority from the *Fettah-Nagast*, or Abyssinian canons, gives a totally different sentence of ordination. We acknowledge that the impression produced upon us by these various utterances of the Sacred Congregation is simply that they are determined, at whatever cost of consistency and reason, to avoid recognising the validity of our orders.

But, apart from the question of the consistency of the decisions of the Congregation, we do not mean to deny that we perceive the force of the reasons which Canon Estcourt gives for the general principle, that words may be

VOL. V.--NO. X.

U

used in such a way, and with such a meaning, as to destroy their validity in a particular case, even though they may be valid in others; and that if these reasons could indeed be proved applicable to the Anglican rite, we should feel much doubt of its sufficiency. In truth, none but thorough formalists can contend that certain forms of words are to be considered valid, irrespectively of the intention of the church in using them. And this it is which gives reason to say deliberately that had the revision of the Ordinal, proposed to the Church of Ireland, been carried, great doubt might have been cast upon the validity of the Orders conferred by her. Should any of our readers be tempted to attach weight to the specious argument that all the ancient forms of Ordination known to us were precatory, we beg them to remember that neither reason nor the established principles of theology allow the question of the sufficiency of a form to be determined after such a summary fashion. The context and the known intention of the form must also be carefully taken into account.

Now, in weighing the intention of a form, a deliberate declaration of its purpose put forth by those who drew it up would be a most valuable guide. Such a declaration we have in respect of our Ordinal; for its preface recounts that, '*from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's church—bishops, priests and deacons.*' '*And therefore, to the intent these orders should be continued and reverently used, it is requisite that no man shall execute them except he be admitted after this form.*' It is impossible to conceive how the compilers could have stated more strongly their desire to maintain the succession of Holy Orders in that essential meaning of the institution in which it had existed from the time of Christ, all down through the primitive and the middle ages to the age then present. We do not believe that any such declaration of intention could have been made by any body of men holding mere Protestant conceptions of Orders. But Canon Estcourt does not, so far as we remember, notice this profession of intention in the preface at all. He prefers to discover the intention of the form from the form itself.

On what grounds is it, then, that words which were considered by Rome to be sufficient when used with the utmost irreverence by the half-barbarous Abyssinians, are to be condemned as insufficient when used reverently and religiously in a body so much in earnest as the Church of England? We must refer the reader to Canon Estcourt's work for the details of the argument, giving here, in our own words, as

truthful and forcible a statement of it as we can, but without involving ourselves in technical questions of theology, such as that of 'character,' upon which the broad issue of validity could never be supposed to turn.

The grace of Orders is a different thing from the grace given by the same Spirit for the discharge of the duties of a civil or secular office. No one can doubt that grace to assist the due discharge of any office will be given to earnest prayer. But in the case of secular affairs, the office is, in its immediate origin, the creation of men, and so is the appointment of the person to it; and God fits him to discharge his duty. But this does not at all come up to the description of what God does in Ordination as Holy Scripture describes it, and as the Church has always held. It is not merely that He gives grace to perform the duties of the priesthood, but the priesthood itself is His gift and grace. He makes a man a *good* magistrate; it is the secular power that makes the man a magistrate at all. But it is not merely that the Holy Ghost makes a man a *good* priest; it is He alone who makes him a priest. And so S. Paul speaks to the elders of Ephesus: 'The Holy Ghost hath made you overseers to feed the Church of God.'

It is quite certain that many at all times, but especially many at the period of the Reformation, failed to grasp this theory of Holy Orders. The sacred ministry appeared to them as an office to which men were called and appointed by other men, while God might, as in the case of any other office, be asked and confidently expected to supply them with grace to do its duties rightly. Now, it might be conceived that the words in which this gift of the Holy Ghost should be sought for, and those in which it should be assured to those who sought for it, might be very strong indeed, while yet the conception that the Holy Ghost not only fits a man for the office, but promotes him to it, and passes upon him that change which places him in it, might be entirely absent. And this, as we understand Canon Estcourt, is his contention concerning the words of our Ordinal. 'Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest' was meant, he thinks, by those who framed the Ordinal, to describe only that same relation of the Holy Ghost to the priesthood which He has to any secular office. For, in respect of a secular office, it might quite conceivably be said by any one who had authority to say it—'Receive the Holy Ghost for this office and work,' without thereby at all implying the ascription to the Holy Ghost of the act itself by which the man is invested with the office and its powers. The question, then, is whether the words of

our Ordinal were intended to be used in this imperfect sense, or in that more complete one in which both the office itself and the power to exercise its functions rightly, or even to exercise them at all, are ascribed to God.

In the first place, we observe that, whatever possibility there may appear to be of the imperfect sense having been intended belongs almost wholly to the form of 1662, when the words 'for the office and work of a priest' were added. And this fact places Canon Estcourt curiously at variance with his predecessor Dom Raynal. Raynal lays all his stress upon the inadequacy of the Edwardian forms, and says, 'There is no need of comment to show how the empty forms of King Edward VI. were rendered sufficient for valid ordination;' while Canon Estcourt says, 'To this ambiguous form, so clogged and fettered already with mutilations and additions made in a depraved sense, and for the purpose of introducing error, the revision of 1662 made another addition, which tied and limited the meaning to that of receiving the grace of the Holy Ghost solely for the discharge of the office and work of a priest or bishop, but not as a sacramental character or a spiritual power. Thus the due sense and right intention are absolutely excluded from the rite.' Truly, the defect of our form can scarcely be very obvious when learned doctors differ so completely as to its nature, that one supposes the change of 1662 to have rendered the form valid, while the other considers it to have been made thus a great deal worse than it was before.

It is obvious to remark that the historical circumstances of 1662 make it very unlikely that any such depravation would have then taken place. All Canon Estcourt's trouble in hunting up the Lutheran senses of the words 'called,' 'examined,' 'tried,' 'admitted,' and so forth, and pointing out how these words occur in the previous parts of the Ordinal, is quite wasted for the purpose of explaining what was meant by 'for the office and work of a priest.' For the divines who made this addition had not the smallest tendency towards any such theories. There can be no doubt that they were influenced by the wish to bring the form into stricter conformity with the ancient offices which Morinus had printed, by making mention in the sentence of Ordination of the particular grade in the ministry which was being conferred. This was unnecessary, seeing how distinct such mention had been in previous parts of the office, and how sufficient, according to all precedent, such previous mention is. But it is in the highest degree unlikely that these Caroline divines can have intended anything else but a thoroughly Catholic

idea of the sacred ministry: any doubtful terms in their work, if such there were, ought in reason to be explained in that sense.

When we come to examine the terms, we find that they have not merely said, 'Receive the Holy Ghost' for the work of a priest, but also for the office. Even had it been merely *work*, we might still have fairly contended that to endow a man with grace for the work of an office, is to invest him with its powers, unless there has been some quite separate form of investiture; and that the reception of the Holy Ghost for the work of a priest is indeed that gift of 'power' which Canon Estcourt desiderates in our form.¹ Thus the gift of power for the work of Christian life, which is given us in baptism, is also the gift of Christian life itself. But they have said also 'for the office of a priest,' not, be it observed, for the *discharge of the office*, as Canon Estcourt says, but for the office itself. We cannot tell what the reception of the Holy Ghost for the office, as distinguished from the work, can be, except this, that the Holy Ghost invests a man with the character of the office at the same time that He endows him with power for its work. Office here appears to stand for *munus* in the old Ordinals. It is not very correct to speak of 'discharging an office:' but, if it were, *munere fungi* is also good Latin. Certainly, the criticism which makes our orders depend on the distinction between *office* and *munus* is very fine-spun.

But now we turn to the Ordinal of 1549. We know as matter of history that the inadequate conceptions of Ordination to which Canon Estcourt alludes were before the Reformers of the Church of England, and had met considerable countenance among them. But they regarded the theory not in that timid fashion which might cause them, if they had closed with it, to express it in words and in acts belonging to a different order of ideas. They looked fairly in the face the real and only consistent application of these notions; which is this, the total abolition of any real form of Ordination and the retention of the laying on of hands, if at all, only as a recognition of a previous election. In the before-quoted discussions of 1540, which issued in the 'Necessary Doctrine and Erudition,' and are to be found among Burnet's *Records* (P. i. B. iii. No. xxi.), we find this question proposed, 'Whether in the New Testament be required any

¹ Thus Tournely says that 'the form of ordination consists in the prayer or prayers by which the minister of the sacrament invokes grace on the candidate for orders, whereby he may be enabled to discharge his duties holily and with fruit.'—Kenrick, p. 181.

consecration of a bishop and priest, or only appointing to the office be sufficient?' And the answer of Canterbury (that is, Cranmer) is, that 'he that is appointed to be a bishop or priest needeth no consecration by the Scripture.' Many other influential persons held the same extravagant conception. We know very well how liable Cranmer was to changes of opinion, and the fact that he and his sympathisers entertained these beliefs in 1540 does not make us at all sure that he entertained the same in 1549: more especially as, in the earlier year, Henry VIII. was alive, and Cranmer had thus a strong motive to declare for the King's authority to make priests or bishops as he would. Nay, his subscription to the 'Necessary Doctrine' seems, as Burnet remarks, to show that he had changed the opinion declared in the debate even before the document came out, for the theory of Orders there laid down is totally different from that which he had advocated; but he shows his courtliness by adding to his subscription, 'This is mine opinion and sentence at this present; which, nevertheless, I do not temerarily define but refer the judgment thereof to your Majesty.'

What we wish the reader to observe is, that if in 1549 Cranmer had still held these opinions about Holy Orders, or, holding them, had found himself able to lead the Ordinal Committee to adopt them, they would have displayed themselves in the Ordinal in some thoroughly unmistakable form. Whereas, what do we really find? Bucer's draft did contain a sentence of Ordination which entirely corresponded to the imperfect conception of Ordination to which Canon Estcourt refers. 'The hand of God Almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, be upon you, protect and govern you, that ye may go and bring forth much fruit by your ministry, and that it may remain unto life eternal:' had this been the sentence, it might very well have been represented as a mere blessing or aspiration for grace to perform the duties of an office to which the candidate had been really raised by a calling and appointment preceding. But Bucer's draft is set aside, and words of a totally different character are substituted. It is perfectly manifest that the object must have been to express a wholly different idea upon Ordination.

We are disposed also to lay great stress upon that rationale which we have before explained as guiding the selection of the sentences of Ordination from Scripture. It may, as we have seen, be very fitly described in this way: that the Church of England had the intention of doing what the Lord and what His Apostles did when they made priests

and bishops. The extreme importance of such a reference to Scripture may be illustrated by this, that the validity of the Roman form for conferring Holy Orders probably depends upon a similar reference, though of a very far-fetched kind in comparison to that direct extraction of Scripture words which our Reformers made. We have seen above that the Roman Pontifical embodies our sentence of Ordination; but we have also seen that nobody ever imagined that in that sentence as used in the Roman form *the* act of Ordination consisted. The very rubrics of the Pontifical place the central act in a previous ceremony, namely, the delivery of the vessels. And Pope Eugenius IV. declared this to be the essential point. But we must go further back still, for in spite of his infallibility he was undoubtedly wrong. If he were right, the Roman Church would possess no valid orders at all, for these would have been cut off during the first nine centuries, when this supposed essential form was not used at all; just as our Orders would be nought if the Edwardian forms had been bad. The Pope has been excused on the ground that he is only declaring what are the essentials of Ordination under the Roman form. But he cannot be right even as to this; for could it be supposed that the precatory form and the first laying on of hands were valid up to the ninth century, but although retained and used after that time, yet ceased to be valid because another ceremony was added after them?

Accordingly the best authorities in the Roman Church look, as we have before stated, for the essentials of Ordination in the first laying on of hands, or in the outstretching of hands, which may probably be regarded as forming a continuation of that imposition. Now what are the essential, the sacramental words in that part of the Roman service—the words which, on Canon Estcourt's principles, can be supposed to furnish an adequate form? Not certainly the prayer that God would give the *dignity* of the Presbyterate—for dignity cannot express the impress of a character on the soul; not the prayer 'that God would renew the spirit of holiness in their hearts,' nor 'that they may be worthy co-operators of the episcopal order.' Nor can the essential form, in the case of bishops, be the prayer that God would grant them an episcopal chair to rule His Church. All these expressions fall far short of asking the internal and special grace of the respective Orders. The essential words, the very marrow and centre of the Roman rite, are to be found in the prayer for bishops, that to this servant of His, whom (like Aaron) He has chosen to the ministry of the chief priesthood, God would give this grace

and would complete in His priest the sum of His ministry ; and in this for presbyters, that whereas to the chief priests appointed for ruling His people Israel, God had appointed men of a second order to be helps, He would continue this aid to our weakness and would cause these persons to obtain the office (*munus*) of the second rank. That is to say, the succession of the Christian ministry in the Roman Church depends upon a form in which the high priesthood and priesthood of the Jews are taken as the sources or types of the orders of bishop and presbyter ; and the continuance of the latter is sought from God under the name of the former.

Now we fully recognise the applicability of this type. But certainly, if we were to enter into particulars, we might find points in which the episcopate and presbyterate in themselves and in their mutual relations fail to be adequately designated by these Jewish titles. Yet the form is doubtless good, because it sufficiently expresses, in the language of those who use it, that which is sought of God. But how absurd would it be to contend that these two orders of the ministry can be properly continued by the use of two forms adapted to their respective Old Testament types ; but cannot be continued by means of two forms actually quoted from the New Testament itself, and denoting no types at all, but the very things themselves, the very beginnings in the New Testament Church of those ministries which God is here asked to continue.

For our part, we do not think that the Reformers could possibly have done anything wiser under the circumstances of the time than thus to fall back upon the unimpeachable forms of the New Testament. The Pontifical was in such a state that its revision was among the most patent duties of any divines attempting a reform of the public services. To have translated the Latin would have been to perpetuate the absurdity of treating the quite valid form used at the first imposition as if it were inoperative until an invention of the ninth century had been added ; and then of using a second or third imposition of hands, to confer the essential power of the priesthood upon persons who long previously have received the priesthood and all the powers which belong to it. And in the impossibility of using the forms of the Pontifical—in the din of the numberless questions concerning the nature and powers of the ministry, which were dividing the Church, what wiser thing could there be than to follow the precedent offered by the repetition of the words of Christ for consecrating the Eucharist, and to repeat in the consecration of a bishop the words in which S. Paul describes the effect of

his own consecration of a bishop, and in the ordination of a priest, the words in which the Lord Himself created His ministry and expressed its powers?

And here we may briefly notice a point on which Canon Estcourt bestows much trouble, viz., the light which the concluding words of the form, 'Be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God and of His Holy Sacraments,' cast upon the intention in which the preceding sentence is used. We do not at all deny that a connection between the two clauses existed in the minds of the compilers of the Ordinal. But the conception of priests as stewards is that which is chosen as the leading idea of their office by the Lord Himself (S. Matt. xxiv. 45), and by S. Paul, who desired that a man should account of him as of a minister of Christ and steward of the mysteries of God. And it seems idle to say that so scriptural an exhortation can have any injurious effect upon the meaning of the words preceding. The faithful dispensing of the sacraments means the authoritative assignment or denial of the sacraments, and the faithful dispensing of the Word of God does not signify mere application or exposition of the Bible, but the deliverance of God's messages of pardon or wrath which are His word as coming through His authorised ambassadors. No document is more applicable to the exposition of the Ordinal than the (so called) *Cranmer's Catechism*,¹ set forth in 1548. Let us hear it, then, upon the meaning of this phrase, 'dispenser of the Word of God :—'

When a man after baptism hath grievously sinned, and doubteth in his conscience whether he be in the favour of God or no (as oftentimes it happeneth), then it is hard for him to trust to his own bare imaginations, thinking in this fashion: I know that I have sinned; but yet I am in this opinion, that God is not so cruel a revenger but that He hath forgiven me. For such an opinion without *God's word* is not a true faith, nor is able to stand in the dangerous skirmishes of temptation. But true faith must ever be stayed upon the certain *word and work of God*. Now God doth not speak to us by a voice sounding out of Heaven. But He hath given the keys of the kingdom of Heaven and the authority to forgive sin to the ministers of the Church. Wherefore let him that is a sinner go to one of them, let him acknowledge and confess his sin, and pray him that according to God's commandment he will give him absolution and comfort him with *the word of grace* and forgiveness of his sin. . . . For he that is absolved knoweth for a surety that his sins are forgiven him by the minister. And he knoweth assuredly also that the minister hath authority from God Himself so to do: and, thirdly, he knoweth that God hath made this promise to His ministers and said

¹ *Cranmer's Catechism*. Oxford, 1829, p. 202.

to them, 'To whom ye forgive sins on earth, to him also they shall be forgiven in Heaven.'

These considerations seem to us so decisive that we feel it unnecessary to examine in detail the remaining portion of the service. We should not shrink from doing so, for even if the sentences of ordination had been other than they are, it seems to us that these services do not represent the Lutheran conception, or anything at all like it. And we can very well understand how, in the particular condition of opinion which prevailed, a good deal of the Lutheran terminology should find its way into the rubrics while yet the fundamental conception of the service should remain Catholic. The Lutherans had this reason for inventing a theory of Orders, that they could not for want of bishops confer them after the old fashion; but it would have been a wonder indeed if enough of men had not been found in the Church of England to hinder her from divesting herself of a necessary part of her Catholic inheritance, because the Lutheran fox had lost his tail and invited her to imitate his condition.

We must also entirely decline to be led into an argument as to the degree in which the Church of England does or does not agree with the Church of Rome upon the powers and duties of the priesthood. Whatever powers are contained in the New Testament commission the Church of England has, for she uses that commission; and she wants no other power. What is necessary, according to all recognised principles, is that there should be a form sufficient to claim from the Lord for a particular case, in the faithful manner which He requires, the fulfilment of His promise to continue the ministry of His Church. This being provided, the case becomes exactly the same as that of baptism. The due conditions having been performed, the subordinate agents retire into the background, and in the eyes of the Catholic Church, the Lord appears performing His sure promise. As to baptism, it is, according to all Catholic ideas, totally irrelevant to ask what benefit the agent in baptism understands the grace of the sacrament to be capable of effecting. The ministrant of baptism may entertain the wildest, the most erroneous, or the most inadequate ideas about what a baptized person is bound to believe and do. Yet all that has absolutely no effect upon the validity of the sacrament. Romanists do indeed show themselves extremely careless of these Catholic principles of baptism, and repeat it without scruple upon their proselytes as if it were a mere act of a particular church granting admission into her ranks, instead of an act of Christ granting admission into the

Church universal. But in words, at all events, they acknowledge the Catholic rule; and the same is the rule as to Orders. So speaks S. Augustine: 'Both are sacraments. Both are conferred on a man by a species of consecration, the one when he is baptized, the other when he is ordained; therefore in the Catholic Church neither can be repeated. For when at any time even the prelates returning to the Church from the schism have been in the interests of peace received on renouncing the errors of the schism, and it has seemed that they should bear the same offices which they had borne, they have not been again ordained, but as their baptism so their ordination remained unimpaired, because the defect lay in their separation, which has been corrected by their return to peace and unity, but not in the sacraments, which are the same wherever they are.'¹

And it is on these principles that we should answer Dr. Newman's well-known argument against our Orders, that the Apostolic succession, the sacramental gift of Holy Orders and the Holy Sacrifice are not traditions among Anglicans, and that 'there is surely a strong presumption that the Anglican body has not what it does not profess to have.' We might very well meet with a direct negative this description of the Anglican tradition, but the observation which we now prefer to make is that the very notion of making the recognition of our orders dependent on the degree of consciousness we show of their importance, is one which shows but little belief in the reality of the sacrament of Orders in the minds which conceive it. If Orders be what the Roman Church professes to believe them to be, it is a positive duty incumbent on that Church to ascertain for itself whether clerical proselytes are already ordained or not. It is blasphemous for them to repeat ordination if it has been conferred already. And there are certain duties and ways of life incumbent on every priest, which make it destructive to his soul to live as if he were a layman. It is as absurd to leave the question to our defence of it as if they were to leave the question whether one was baptized or not to the arguments which the Church he had left might care to offer on the question.

The case of our Orders seems to us, we confess, so clear that no genuine doubt can be felt about them by any one who examines the evidence. But at all events it is ridiculous to say that there is not, *primâ facie*, some reason to think they

¹ See other authorities in Tournely *De Ordine*. Paris, 1729, pp. 269 sqq.

may be valid. The Church of Rome has never decided against them. She has indeed, with a carelessness beyond all Protestant carelessness, left her subordinate members to treat them as invalid, but has never brought to bear upon this vitally important matter the means of infallible judgment which she professes to possess. In the only case in which English Orders were before the infallible tribunal, there was flagrant misrepresentation on the part of the person (one Gordon) who sought to have the case decided; misrepresentation which Canon Estcourt excuses on the ground that a convert and a stranger in the case of such a memorial would be wholly in the hands of his advisers! So that it is not clear that the Congregation had under their consideration the real form of Anglican orders at all.¹

The Roman authors, whose works we are reviewing, are wont to declare, as a supplement to their arguments sufficient to cover all defects, that the mind of the Church has been against us. But this mind of the Church is very much what we should call either popular prejudice or the determination of controversialists to find that true which is convenient for their cause. It has rested in each generation successively upon some supposed fact or doctrine which the next has found to be an error. The means of judgment which Rome declares herself possessed of are such that the question need never have been left to this slipshod decision by popular feeling or inclination. Yet who has ever heard that any of that considerable number of priests who have gone from us to Rome was warned that perhaps he was really a priest and, if so, ought to live as such? We have ourselves known 'verts' with whom the desire to divest themselves of the trammels of Orders was commonly supposed to have no unimportant part in inducing the turning movement. This may not have been true. But the Church which they joined took no pains to ascertain whether she ought not to give them that information concerning their Anglican orders which would render such a temptation on their part and such an imputation on them by others equally impossible. Converts, so called, ordained in the English Church, may be seen in the smoking-rooms of Continental hotels or in ball-rooms at home, displaying their new-found Catholicism by an attire and conversation more laical than that of ordinary laymen.

¹ Nevertheless Dr. Kenrick (p. 158) supposes the question of Anglican orders to have been decided in Gordon's case. This is only one of many statements in his chapter on the Anglican form which his successor Canon Estcourt perceives to be quite untenable.

Any one who is acquainted with human nature might know beforehand that such a contemptuous rejection of old and sacred restraints cannot possibly take place without the most serious deterioration of the spiritual condition. And we remember to have read and heard that such a consequence had been in many cases observed by serious Roman Catholics. Yet, was any adviser ever found to say in such a case, 'the validity of Anglican orders is only doubtful. It has never been decided by the Church. But we have an infallible tribunal established by God for the benefit of mankind, lest souls should be suffered to lie under errors which might be fatal. This tribunal has delivered one decision which seems adverse to Anglican orders; but it now appears that the case was not really before it at all. It has delivered at a week's interval another decision which seems by analogy to sanction them; but it now appears that first this was not really an infallible decision, and secondly that there are differences in the two cases which make it not so applicable to the question as at first sight it appeared to be. We shall therefore, in charity to your soul, take care that the light of infallibility shall be turned fully upon your case as it is; lest at the judgment day it should prove that you were really a priest when we and you yourself treated you as if you were none, and so we both should come at the hands of that Great High Priest, who cares for the honour of His commission, to great shame and punishment.'

No such thing is ever said. The Roman Church prefers to leave the question undecided for her own controversial advantage. And she hereby proves the taunts upon the shortcomings of the Anglican tradition to be capable of being retorted with far greater justice against herself. Nothing could show more decisively than the conduct of the Roman Church in this matter that she does not grasp the conception of Holy Orders as a great reality, but thinks of them as a mere human opinion. And the English Church has given at least this proof of her belief in their reality, that she never, even in the times when by a natural repulsion from Roman error and tyranny she was driven farthest in the Puritan direction, has denied the validity of Roman Orders. Of course it will be replied that in doing so she would have cut off her own succession by invalidating her pre-Reformation priesthood. But in the first place that would not have been a matter of any importance if the Apostolical succession had been, as Dr. Newman asserts, no tradition of Anglicanism; and, in the second place, it might have been plausibly argued

that the Roman Church, after the rejection of the Reformation, and after her system had been formulated at Trent, held a position radically different from that of the pre-Reformation Church.

But this argument has never been advanced ; the English Church has considered, not what would best enable her to throw contempt on her adversary, but what was true ; and until the Roman Church has brought all her powers to bear upon the decision of the question of our orders, she has little reason indeed to taunt us as though we did not show ourselves alive to the reality of the priesthood in the Church of Christ.

ART. II.—THE SPIRITUAL CLAIMS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

1. *A Treatise on the Church of Christ*. By WILLIAM PALMER, M.A. Fourth edition. 2 vols. (London, 1842.)
2. *The Church of England cleared from the Charge of Schism*, By T. W. ALLIES, M.A. Second edition. (Oxford, 1848.)
3. *Dissent in its relation to the Church of England*. Bampton Lectures for 1871. By GEORGE HERBERT CURTEIS, M.A. New edition. (London, 1876.)
4. *Apostolical Succession in the Church of England*. By ARTHUR W. HADDAN, B.D. (London, 1869.)
5. *The Church's Broken Unity*. By W. J. E. BENNETT, M.A. 5 vols. (London, n.d.)

I. THERE are at this moment (1878) in England and Wales *one hundred and fifty-four* different religious bodies which have certified their places of meeting to the Registrar-General, and there are probably some more which have not yet done so, making altogether about *one hundred and sixty*. All these, except two Jewish bodies and some three or four more, claim to be Christians of one kind or another. Very many allege themselves to be THE CHURCH, to be the only true representatives of pure Christianity, while all others, they say, are in partial or total error. How is a plain man to decide on all these rival claims, and to have any ground of confidence that he is choosing right in joining any one of them ?

II. No one is bound to inquire into every claim, to examine the belief and practice of each sect, before making a

choice. Were it otherwise, a lifetime might be spent before coming to any conclusion. The first rule that common-sense suggests is, that very small societies, which sprang up only the other day, whose founder is still alive or but just dead, may be left out of the reckoning at the outset ; not because they are small, new, and obscure, for that was once true of the whole Christian body ; but because there have been millions of good Christians for many hundreds of years before these societies were founded, and, therefore, it is quite certain that they were not wanted formerly, and very likely that they are not wanted now. Such of them as say that they have something *new* to tell us from God, some *fresh* revelation of His will (as a few do say), may fairly ask to have their title-deeds and proofs looked into ; but those which merely profess to be working on the old lines of the old Gospel are at once discredited by their very newness, since what their claims really amount to is this : that they are the *first* persons who have ever taught pure Christianity, and that every one who came before them was more or less wrong. They may be very good and pious people, there may be a great deal of truth mixed up in their teaching, but they cannot be THE CHURCH of GOD. The most that can be said for them is, that they are doing over again what has been as well and probably better done before.

III. Another way of clearing the ground is to classify the rival sects a little ; when it is at once seen that a great many of them are mere varieties or off-shoots from some larger body, and especially from the Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians. Consequently, it is quite enough to examine the claims of the parent society in each of these cases. If those claims will stand inquiry, then it is quite right to ask next, which of the various kindred bodies (whether the original stock or one of the branches) is the best and purest ; but if the claims of the parent society break down when tested, then it is quite unnecessary to look any further in that direction. If a man who laid claim to an estate had several sons and daughters, it might be worth a lawyer's while to find out which of them was the true heir to the estate ; but if the father himself clearly had no right at all to it, then there would not be any use in examining the children's claim, derived solely through him. Accordingly, no man need look into every little branch sect. It is quite enough, and often much more than enough, for him to examine the parent stem ; and unless it prove to be now, or to have once been, THE CHURCH, they fall with it. And, thirdly, most foreign religious bodies in England, such as the

Greek Church and the German Lutherans, which undertake to look after their own countrymen alone, and do not try to make converts here, may be practically left out of account also.

IV. These three clearing processes shorten the inquiry very much, because they enable the searcher to confine his attention to about a dozen bodies instead of a hundred and sixty. These are the Church of England, the Church of Rome, the Presbyterians, Baptists, Independents or (as they now prefer to call themselves) Congregationalists, Moravians, Quakers, Methodists and Unitarians, in one group; and, in another, the Swedenborgians, Mormons, and Irvingites, who lay claim to a new message or revelation.

V. Of all these, the most important every way in this country is the Church of England. It is not only larger in numbers than all the other bodies put together, but it differs from them in another very noticeable way. That is, it is *everywhere* in the country. There are scores of the smaller sects which have to be hunted up with great difficulty by people who wish to learn anything about them, and which, when found at last, prove to have no members outside a very narrow district, perhaps a single meeting, so that very little is ever known of them. Even the larger and older sects are not always to be met with. There are hundreds of places where there are no Roman Catholics, Quakers, or Presbyterians; there are scores where there are no Baptists, Independents, or Methodists. But there is no spot whatever in England and Wales which is not part of some Anglican parish, and there is no parish in the whole number which has not a clergyman of the Church of England in charge of it, and a church either actually in it, or, in the very few cases where there is not one literally within it, at any rate close by and easily reached.

VI. There is yet another most remarkable difference between the Church of England and the other religious societies in the country. It is much more *public* than any of them. If a Roman Catholic clergyman give notice that no one shall be admitted to his chapel for worship without paying an entrance fee of so many pence, he has a perfect legal right to do it, and, in fact, it has been very often done. If a Baptist or Methodist pastor should refuse to let any one in to his meeting who is not a member of his society, that too would be an arrangement with which the law could not meddle, because it looks on all these sects as private societies, with just as much right to settle who shall be present or not at their meetings as the Freemasons or Oddfellows have. But every English parishioner has a right at common law to a seat in the parish church, and in no

church, even when extra-parochial, unless the mere private chapel of some institution, can the clergyman shut the doors during public worship against any one who chooses to come in and conduct himself quietly. This custom has come down from a time when every one living in England, except a few Jews, was a member of the Church of England; and though many religious changes have taken place since that day, yet the rights of all Englishmen to the benefits of the National Church have been left untouched. And thus it is that very large numbers of Nonconformists resort to the Church of England for marriages and funerals, though the services of their own pastors are open to them.

VII. But one great law of morals is, that wherever there are *rights* there are *duties* also. No one may justly *take* without *giving* something in return. A child takes food, shelter, clothing from its parents, and is bound to show them obedience on its part. A servant must give labour in payment for wages and board. Even in countries where slavery is kept up, the slave-owner is required by law and custom to provide for his slaves in sickness and old age, in consideration of his being able to compel their service during youth and health. People who are defended by an army and protected by a police are rightly obliged to pay taxes for their maintenance, and so on. And though the law of the State with us has piecemeal discharged Nonconformists from all legal obligation to make any return to the Church for the rights in her which they enjoy, no one but God can dispense with the moral obligation, so long as Nonconformists do exercise those rights, and do not give them up as having no just title to them. And the Church of England on its part claims duty and obedience from all English citizens. If the parish church be their parish church, as it undoubtedly is, they in turn are the parishioners of the Church clergyman, who claims all of them as his flock; exactly because he is bound to minister to every one of them who asks him, and to offer his services even to those who do not ask him; whereas no Baptist or Methodist minister is responsible in any sense for people who do not voluntarily join his society and congregation.

VIII. The outcome of all these facts, that the Church of England is *everywhere* in the land, that it is the most *public* of all institutions wherever it is found—even the Poor Law, though also in every parish, meddles with only the pauper class—and that, by calling itself the *Church of England*, it lays claim to the obedience of all English folk, is that it is forced on the attention of every man, woman, and child in the country.

It is God's will that they all must know something about it. They cannot say, as they might say of Quakerism or of Irvingism, 'It has never come in my way, so I need not trouble myself about it.' Nor can they say, as they can say of Jews, 'It makes no call on me, and I have nothing to do with it. I go my way and it goes its way—it keeps to its people, and I keep to mine.' Nor, again—and this is another very noticeable thing—can they say, 'The Church is a new-comer here, and I like old ways best. I am too old-fashioned to change.' For it is exactly the Church which is the oldest thing in the parish. In most places there are a good many people who can remember, or who have heard their fathers or grandfathers tell, how and when the first Dissenting meeting began amongst them. Only here and there, and that chiefly in a few towns, are there any Dissenting congregations which have been so long settled without breaking up or dispersing, that they are older than the grandfathers of those who are aged men now. But the Church has been in every parish long before the great-grandfathers of those grandfathers were born, before the oldest family in any county was heard of, before the oldest oaks now standing were planted. Men must see it, they must know of it, they cannot help having something to do with it at one time or another, and so they cannot shut their eyes to it, but are bound to ask, 'What is it, how did it come here, and what does it all mean?'

IX. Now, so far, nothing has been done to prove that it is The Church of God in this country, for the same antiquity and widespread character are found attached to false religions in other countries, such as the heathenism of India and China, and the Mohammedanism of Persia and Arabia. But no person who is a native of those countries or a settler in them can avoid taking notice of their chief religion, for it is thrust daily on his attention. He is bound to look into it somehow, and to be able to give some good reason why he does not follow it; why, indeed, he sometimes actually fights against it; for its being there, and his being there, prove that God meant him to know something about it, and not shut his eyes to its existence. But the enormous majority of English Dissenters have never troubled themselves to examine the claims of the great religious society which confronts them every day of their lives, and so far they have failed in a clear matter of duty.

X. How are they to set about it? The answer is, 'To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them' (Isa. viii. 20). In the first place, the Bible tells us plainly that God set up

a visible Church, with known officers and definite laws, and revealed it to the Jewish nation through the agency of Moses. To enter into covenant with God, it was not enough to believe certain Mosaic doctrines, nor to practise certain Levitical rites; it was also necessary to become a member of the visible Jewish Church, to obey its laws, and to be in full communion with its ministers. Out of this Jewish Church as the germ, the Lord Jesus Christ formed His new Church of Christian believers. It too is *visible*, for He said when He first founded it, and taught His disciples: 'Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid' (S. Matt. v. 14). It has its own *officers*, for 'God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers' (1 Cor. xii. 28); 'And He gave some apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers' (Eph. iv. 11). It is *one*, and one only, for 'there is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling' (Eph. iv. 4); 'So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another' (Rom. xii. 5). And that because by one spirit are we all baptized into one body (1 Cor. xii. 13). This body has only *one* creed, for there is 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism' (Eph. iv. 5). And that faith is 'the faith which was once [for all] delivered unto the saints' (Jude 3). It is a sin to disobey this body, for it is commanded by our Lord Himself, that if any man 'neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican' (S. Matt. xviii. 17). Its doctrines, laws, and even customs, may not be departed from at any man's pleasure, for the Apostle Paul gives it as a sufficient reason for discountenancing a mere outward ceremonial usage, that 'we have no such custom, neither the churches of God' (1 Cor. xi. 16). And he therefore lays down this stern rule, 'Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the traditions ye received from us' (2 Thess. iii. 6). And the manner of preventing such schisms and divisions is set forth: 'I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you' (1 Cor. i. 10). 'I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them; for they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ' (Rom. xvi. 17, 18).

XI. But the hundred and sixty sects do not form one body in any sense; they have no unity of faith, for they contradict

one another's teaching in every particular ; their officers and ministers are rivals and competitors, not colleagues in the same service ; their customs and traditions are unlike ; they actually take pride in their divisions, instead of regarding them as sinful. It is quite clear, therefore, that the 'common Christianity' which some people talk of, as being jointly held by all these together, is not in the least degree like the sort of Christianity which our Lord set up and S. Paul preached. Nor is there any hint in the New Testament of another popular opinion, that the Church is a secret, hidden society, known only to God, and that people differing from each other on almost every conceivable point may equally belong to it, though to outward appearance they have no connexion with one another. It is quite plain that every believer in S. Paul's day must have known whether he was a member of the same body as S. Paul was, or of one of those divisions and heresies against which he warned his hearers (Acts xx. 30). There *is* an Invisible Church, true enough, but it consists of the Angels and of Christians who now rest in Christ, and is part of that *one* Church which is visible here on earth. But we are told of no way to enter the Invisible Church save through the gates of the Visible Church. God can, and doubtless will, save countless multitudes who have never been in this Church on earth, but Holy Writ does not teach that they will rise to the dignity of those 'kings and priests' who were made members of His kingdom here.

XII. What marks, then, does the New Testament give us, by which we can know the True Church from counterfeits ? The same as those which betokened the first converts made on the Day of Pentecost. They were baptized, and they 'continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayer' (Acts ii. 41, 42). Here, then, we have a few very simple rules which will help us. First of all, we may strike out all sects such as the Quakers, which do not baptize at all, or those like the Unitarians, who do not baptize in the way Jesus Christ ordained, 'In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost' (S. Matt. xxviii. 19). Next, there must be agreement in the Apostles' *doctrine*, and this strikes out all sects which go outside the Bible, and have a private revelation of their own, like the Swedenborgians and Mormons, whose doctrine is in many respects new, and cannot be traced back for any long time. For it is quite clear that no doctrine which cannot be found set down in the Bible, nor in any book more than a hundred years old or so, can be part of the

Apostles' doctrine, seeing that the last survivor of the Apostolic body died nearly eighteen hundred years ago. It strikes out also even those sects which profess to show chapter and verse in the Bible for all their opinions, if they cannot also show that Christians have all along held them, and that it is not merely a wrong explanation they have given to Scripture texts, like that of the young man who literally cut off his own right hand and put out his right eye, because he thought such was the meaning of S. Matt. v. 29, 30. But this is a difficult inquiry, not easy for any but learned people to make, since an ordinary reader may think some meaning of various texts so plain, especially if he have been taught that meaning carefully by his minister, that he will be quite surprised at hearing that any other sense is ever put on those texts, and will not believe at all that his favourite explanation of them was never heard of till quite lately. But the next test is a plainer one, that of belonging to the Apostles' *fellowship*, that is to say, their company, society, or union. This goes a long way beyond agreeing with them in opinion. Just so, all people who spend their lives at sea are *sailors*, but those sailors who enter on board private merchantmen or foreign ships do not belong to the fellowship of the *Royal Navy*.

A new Shipping Company, no matter how rich and respectable, or how fine a fleet it had, or how well it paid its officers and men, could not ever be the same thing as the famous service which fought England's battles under Drake, Benbow, Rodney, and Nelson. Now suppose that the captains and crews of one of these Companies were to claim to belong to the Navy, and to be as good or better than any other sailors, people would naturally ask to see the ships' commissions and the officers' warrants. And on finding that they ran in the name of a private firm, and not of the Queen, it would at once appear that they could not make out their case. Again, if any man lay claim to the title or estates of some noble family, he is bound to prove in a court of law that he is really the true heir. It is not enough for him to show that he comes from the same original stock as the present owners, nor even that they have no right to what they hold, unless he can also show that he himself, and no other, has that right, and has been in some way or other unjustly ousted. Now, if it turned out on the trial that the present owner could not only produce the title-deeds, but could show that he and his ancestors had held the very same estate from father to son for centuries, while the claimant could neither trace his descent beyond his grandfather, nor tell anything

about the generation before that, nor give evidence that any of his people had ever possessed the disputed estate, he would not only lose his action, but would be thought a very dishonest man for having brought it at all.

XIII. Now let us apply this reasoning to the rival claims of the Church of England and of the Dissenting sects. Any society which claims to be 'the Apostles' fellowship' must be a very old one, quite the oldest in the country, because, as said already, all the Apostles died nearly eighteen hundred years ago. A later date for the beginning of any religious body at once disproves its title; just as it disproves the claim of a man to be heir to an entailed estate or title as his father's eldest son, to show that he was born many years after one of his brothers still alive. What are the facts about the chief Protestant Dissenting bodies in England? First of all, every one of them consists of the descendants of people who broke away from the Church of England, and set up for themselves, or else of seceders from these again. So they are all *younger* than the Church in this country, and thus, on the face of things, their claim is not nearly so good.

XIV. But it may be said, 'It is true that these sects are not so old *in England* as the Church is, but some of them have gone back to an earlier and purer pattern, and are joined to societies which arose abroad, and which are much older than the Established Church is.' This is a very good answer, if only it be true. But is it true? If we try to trace back the Presbyterians, we cannot find any source or parent for them before John Calvin, who was born in 1509, and who invented this new society about 1535. If we take the Baptists, they were never heard of anywhere till 1521, and then almost immediately as guilty of the most frightful crimes against religion and morals. The Independents or Congregationalists can show no pedigree going back earlier than 1550 or thereabouts, and they are, moreover, above all other sects unable to allege continuous fellowship in the same society, because their fundamental principle is that every separate congregation is a complete and independent Church in itself, having full right to settle its own doctrine and discipline, and elect its own pastors in its own way—a principle which at once shows that it has no relation whatever to the one Church of the Gospel, separation from which was a sin, nor to the Apostolic ministry, claiming authority over the flocks, not in virtue of election by them, but of commission from Christ Himself, as in the case of the Twelve, or from Him mediately through the Apostles, like Timothy and Titus. The Moravians are a good

deal older, but even they cannot bring proof of origin as a distinct body before 1467, when they broke away from the older Church in communion with Rome. The Unitarian body in this country, though agreeing largely in doctrine with some very ancient but extinct sects, is barely a century old as an English society; and as to the Quakers, they began in 1650, while many of the original members of the Irvingites are alive still. As to the Methodists, their position is the most untenable of all, for John Wesley, their founder, never meant them to be more than an inner fellowship or guild of strict members of the Church of England, working in it and for it; while he himself, as well as his brother Charles, lived and died a clergyman of that Church, forbidding almost with his latest breath any of his disciples to separate from it or set up as a rival body. And in any case, even were this not so, the Methodists go back no further than 1739. Now, when any one of these societies calls itself *a Church* or *the Church*, it is bound to show its right to the name, and that it cannot do without being able to trace back many hundreds of years earlier than the oldest of them does show proof for. The force of these dates is this: Unless there were no Christians at all before the very oldest of these sects began, that is to say, no Christians for nearly fifteen hundred years after Christ, none of these sects can be that original Christian Church set up by our Lord, or be anything except one of those divisions, schisms, and heresies, breaking away from the Church, which the Apostles foretold would spring up, and besought their converts to avoid. And if this be true even of such large, important, and comparatively long-established bodies as those just named, much more is it true of the little, obscure, modern sects (Plymouth Brethren and the like) which have sprung up lately here and in America. For if any of them be in the right, then there never has been a Church of God in the world till quite the other day, and then only amongst a tiny handful of English-speaking folks; while all the hundreds of millions of other Christians who lived and died, from the Apostles' time to our own, including the greatest saints and martyrs, were all in the dark and in the wrong, since it is quite impossible to show that any set of people in the ancient times of Christianity believed as these new sectaries do. And since our religion is one given by revelation from God, not one invented by man, which men can improve as time goes on, just as they improve steam-engines and telegraphs, it follows as a maxim of Christianity that whatever can be shown to be *new* in it is also *false*. An opinion or practice amongst

Christians may be very old indeed and yet not be true ; but it cannot be true *unless* it be old, because it is not 'the faith once delivered to the saints,' not 'all the counsel of God,' which the Apostles declared to their converts (Acts xx. 27).

XV. Now, to all this serious charge against the Dissenting sects there are two answers commonly made, one by the ordinary uneducated Dissenter, the other by more learned and thoughtful ones. The first says, 'I don't care about your dates and figures. I go straight to the Bible for my religion, and as I believe what is written there, I also believe exactly what the Apostles did.' But nearly every one of the hundred and sixty sects makes exactly the same speech and the same claim, whereas they do not agree in any one point with one another. The Unitarian cannot find Christ's Godhead in the New Testament ; the Quaker cannot find Baptism or the Holy Communion ; the Plymouth Brethren cannot find any settled ministry or pastorate ; and so on. And they all pass as quickly as possible over those important texts concerning the Church of God, of which a few were given above (X.), because they have no ready way of explaining how it is that their new societies took the place, and succeeded to the rights, of that one Church which alone the New Testament sets before us. The plain fact, which people who talk in this way do not understand, is that God most certainly did not intend people to pick and choose their religion for themselves out of the Bible. And that He has proved to us by not allowing printing to be discovered until fourteen hundred years after our Lord's Ascension, so that Bibles could not be cheap or common till then ; while even now, out of the four hundred millions of Christians in the world, not half can read, and even if they could, there are scores of languages into which the Bible has not yet been translated, though there are Christians who speak them. If men were to treat the Statute Book, or a large Medical Dictionary, in the way they do the Bible, and fancy they had only to open one or the other of them, pretty much at random, to find out what to do in some tough legal difficulty, or in some strange fit of sickness, without having any real previous training as lawyers or doctors, every one would recognise their folly at once, and would naturally look for ruin or death as the end of their quackery. And yet they fancy that the 'deep things of God,' which the very angels desire to look into, but find too hard for them, can be easily discovered and mastered in no better fashion.

XVI. The cleverer Protestants see this quite plainly, and

being fully aware that unless they can make out somehow, not only that there are texts in the Bible which are in their favour, but that these texts have been explained in their way by Christians ever since the first preaching of the Gospel till now, their cause breaks down, answer thus:—

‘Immediately after the death of the Apostles, great errors and corruptions crept by degrees into the Christian Church, and overspread it everywhere. Only a small, hidden, persecuted remnant preserved the purity of the faith, and handed it down from age to age, being despised, slandered, and rejected as heretics, and known by various names, such as Paulicians, Albigenses, Waldenses, Lollards, and so on, till Apostolic truth was recovered at the Reformation.’

Now, this reply involves at the very outset two Scriptural difficulties. First, if it be the fact that real Christianity was practically lost and gone for about fourteen hundred years, then the gates of hell *did* prevail against the Church, contrary to Christ's express promise (S. Matt. xvi. 18), though that promise was faithfully kept all through the terrible sufferings of the early Christians, when it seemed, almost every day, for 250 years, as though the Pagans would soon crush them out entirely, and leave no trace of them remaining. Next, if the Church did dwindle to the size and character of a secret sect, hiding its teaching as Freemasons do theirs, then it was no longer ‘the light of the world,’ nor ‘a city set on a hill, that cannot be hid’ (S. Matt. v. 14), but at best a dim rushlight under a bushel, a mere hut at the bottom of a mine, instead of answering to our Lord's description. Many proofs would be wanted before we could accept such a curious theory, especially as the missionary success of the ancient Church enormously surpassed that of the modern sects. But, of course, *if* all the links in the chain be perfect, if what are popularly called Protestant Evangelical doctrines now, really *can* be traced through these various sects and societies from very early times down to the Reformation, it is so far a strong argument. But what are the facts? Not to waste time by testing every link separately, it will be enough to take two of them, and to say briefly that the Paulicians and Albigenses *never were Christians at all*, but had another religion of their own, as different from Christianity as Judaism and Mohammedanism, though it borrowed a few words and doctrines from Christianity, just as the Taepings in China and the Hau-haus in New Zealand did the other day. The Paulicians taught that there were two Gods, a good one and a bad one, and that Jehovah, the

author of the Old Testament, was the bad one, so that they rejected the entire of the Old Testament, as not only uninspired, but evil; while they partly rejected baptism, and wholly rejected the Eucharist, because teaching, as they did, that all matter is evil, and created by the evil God, they declared that bread and wine could do no good, but might do harm, to the soul, created, like all other spirits, by the good God. The Albigenses agreed in these opinions, and, besides, taught that marriage is unlawful, denied the Resurrection, reduced Christ to a subordinate phantom, neither God nor man, and enjoined suicide under certain circumstances as a religious obligation. That is not a very creditable pedigree, but, nevertheless, these two bodies, Paulicians and Albigenses, *figure in every list of the kind* that is drawn up by Protestants who try to show that Protestant doctrines are ancient. This misrepresentation is neither wholly deliberate and conscious, nor yet due to mere ignorance. The fact is, that the secret sects in question have always thought themselves justified in concealing their tenets when acknowledgment would be dangerous, and in pretending to be members of some more nearly Christian societies. And this has led to error in two ways. First of all, the Albigenses have got mixed up in popular opinion with the Waldenses, a much younger and more harmless body. These Waldenses began, as a sect, about the year 1160, in almost the very same way as Wesleyan Methodists began in England 600 years later. A pious merchant of Lyons, named Peter Waldo, wished to begin a society of lay preachers to work amongst the poor, and not being able to get permission from the Pope to organise it as he desired, set up for himself, and sent his preachers on his own authority. But he was a Roman Catholic at first, and never departed very widely from his early belief, though, just as with the Methodists, his new society drifted before long, and that permanently, from its original position. But they never at any time held Albigensian doctrines, though refugees from that sect, taking shelter amongst them, outwardly conformed to their usages, so that the antiquity of the Albigenses has been tacked on to the modern origin of the Waldenses, to make them appear a very ancient body; and, in return, the tenets of the Waldenses have been ascribed to the Albigenses, to make these pass for orthodox Christians, so that between the two a sect which never existed has been invented, claiming to have held and transmitted Evangelical doctrines from the days of the Apostles. But the combination is like Barnum's artificial mermaid—half monkey, half fish, and all sham. In any case, even if

the Waldenses ever had any claim to great antiquity in the succession of their ministers and the transmission of their doctrines, and even if it were not fully established that they did not begin before 1160, their line has become extinct in both respects. For the entire body of their *barbes* or pastors died out to a man in a plague in the seventeenth century, and was replaced by Protestant ministers brought from Switzerland, who naturally taught their own tenets, dating back, of course, no further than the Reformation. The existing sect is, therefore, Waldensian only in name, and does not now differ in any respect from Swiss or French Protestantism.

And, next, as the secret sects were naturally very bitter against the Church of Rome, which had hunted them down many times, they were glad to avail themselves of the help and shelter afforded them by Lutherans and Calvinists at the Reformation, feeling sure (as proved to be the case), that if only they denounced Romanism loudly enough, and so aided the popular movement, no questions would be asked about their own opinions, although had they avowed them, their new allies would have been the first to turn against them. They acted like the criminal classes of great cities in a political riot who, joining their voices to a party cry, busy themselves with plundering, under the guise of patriotism, the houses which the mob is wrecking for political reasons.

Such is the condition of the claim. Those sects which are really ancient are not even colourably Christian, and those which accept the Christian creeds, but hold aloof from the great historical Churches, are all modern, and thus, at best, even if they could show that they hold the Apostles' doctrine, they do not belong to the Apostles' fellowship, but have actually broken away from it, in order to set up new societies of their own, with new officers, acting in opposition to those who can produce their commission. And if they should argue, as they often do, that substantial unity underlies the surface differences of custom and organisation, the two other tests named in Acts ii. 42, will settle the truth of this plea. Do they *break bread*—that is, join in the Holy Communion, and *pray* in company with the members of the Church, or do they set up rival places of religious assembly, in which they meet apart from the older society? The answer is, that they not only do so, but endeavour to draw away members of the Church into their assemblies, and thus are in no sense supplementing the action of the Church, but rivalling and injuring it. Hence, the question which now has to be considered is whether they are in any such respect superior

to the Church in their character and teaching as to be able to override its claims of prior existence in the country.

XVII. In the first place, in order to establish any such claim to superiority, and to prove that it is no matter of self-will or error, the sect which demands to be received as the highest type of Christianity in this country must exhibit some credentials to show that it is entitled to a hearing. It is not enough that it should prove that errors and abuses, from which it claims to be free, are to be found in the Church and other religious bodies; nor is it enough to show that it can offer certain advantages to its members which are not to be found elsewhere. Such arguments would be perfectly valid if we had merely to deal with prospectuses of rival manufacturing companies, each desiring to promote the sale of its own goods, and to depreciate those of its competitors.

But we have not to do in this case with a human organisation or a human product, but with two divine things: (1) the revelation which God has given in the Gospel, and (2) the Society which He has set up on earth to be the keeper, witness, and teacher of that revelation. Consequently, any society which professes to have a clearer view of this revelation than is enjoyed by other communions, must enforce its claim in one of two ways. It must show either that it is, in fact, the original society entrusted with this task, and which has discharged it with unbroken prescription from the time of the Apostles till now; or it must show with equal clearness, if it admit itself to be a new society, that some forfeiture, because of failure of duty, was divinely enacted against the original society, and that its privileges and powers have been as divinely transferred to a younger substitute; exactly as the Gentile Church succeeded to the forfeited rights of the Synagogue. That is to say, nothing short of a fresh revelation, attested by miracles, will justify any of the sects that arose at or since the Reformation in claiming to be The Church. If, however, without asserting for themselves such a high character as this, they content themselves with the lower ground of alleging that, though they cannot teach with authority, nevertheless what they do teach is a purer Gospel than that offered by the Church, they are at once bound to show in what important particular this teaching of theirs differs from that in whose stead they present it. If it be substantially the same doctrinal system—that is to say, based on the three Christian Creeds, and legitimately developed from them—they are bound to prove, on the one hand, either

that the Church has ceased to teach these same doctrines, or, on the other, that they themselves have obtained some fresh and valuable light upon them which gives more depth, point, and fervour to their doctrinal expositions, resulting in a conspicuously higher standard of faith and holiness amongst their members. The necessity of acting in this wise follows from a very obvious consideration. If their doctrine be so very nearly the same as that of the Church of England that they have no scruple in occasionally attending its offices and ministrations, or in admitting that true and faithful Christians are to be found amongst its clergy and laity, then they at once put themselves under the Apostolic ban directed against those who cause schisms and divisions without the gravest necessity. But if, on the other hand, they regard the Church of England as an apostate body, no longer holding or teaching saving truth, they are bound to show in what definite particular it has thus fallen away, and what important doctrine of Scripture is neglected or perverted in its system. It is not enough in such cases to show that individual clergymen or laymen, or even considerable bodies of persons within the Church, hold views which the objector regards as unscriptural—unless it can be shown, at the same time, that the formularies are so entirely in favour of these persons as to exclude conflicting opinions, and prevent persons of a purer faith from remaining within the Church, and endeavouring to cleanse it from all defects and abuses. Nothing is plainer in the New Testament than that only one Church was found in each place. There were quarrels and divisions often, far too often, amongst the members of this Church, as the First Epistle to the Corinthians tells us very plainly; but nothing at all like the modern sight of a number of rival bodies, each claiming to be first, or driven to the necessity of admitting that one is much the same as another, was known in the time of the Apostles. An illustration or two will bring out the force of this objection more clearly than can be done in a general statement. It will be observed by those who give most attention to the specific doctrines of the sects, that their difference from the Church and from each other usually depends on some one doctrinal peculiarity, either some tenet which is held by other Christians, but not so definitely insisted upon nor made so prominent; or else found only within the limits of their own society. In the first of these cases, there is apt to be a very imperfect sense of proportion; that is to say, instead of letting the doctrine in question assume its natural place as part of a great system, it is exaggerated so as to dwarf everything else, and thus to

throw all Christian doctrines except itself into the obscure background. This holds good, for example, among the Primitive Methodists. They have allowed themselves to dwell so exclusively on the idea of sensible conversion, that they have practically forgotten everything else ; and the fact of a man having passed through, or fancied that he has passed through, certain spiritual experiences in the course of a revival, is regarded as a matter of incomparably more importance than purity of doctrine or holiness of life, if unaccompanied by this special token. This is an example of want of scale. Conversion is, undoubtedly, a doctrine of the New Testament, and examples of sudden conversion, such as that of S. Paul, are not absent ; but there is nothing whatever from which we can gather that such was the ordinary manner in which converts were gathered in from amongst the heathen, far less that children brought up from infancy in the knowledge of the Gospel were expected to pass through any such stage before attaining to full membership of the Church. A Methodist who joins the Church of England does not find his favourite doctrine denied or neglected ; he will find not only missionary agencies for gathering in the heathen in foreign lands, but agencies employed also for arousing the negligent in this country, whether nominal Christians, or such as were never brought under the influences of religion ; nor will he find any school within the Church which denies the frequent occurrence of sudden turnings to God, conviction of sin, hearty repentance, and sense of pardon granted in these times of refreshing. The difference will be that he will learn that the Church does not dare to limit God's power by saying that He can and will work only in one fixed way, and that the doctrine which, as expounded by Methodist teachers, overshadowed the whole Christian economy, is in the Church reduced to dimensions much more nearly like those it assumes in the pages of the New Testament. This same principle applies to each distinguishing doctrine of the other larger and more important sects. Thus, for example, the Quakers will find the work of the Holy Spirit and the supremacy of conscience urged with force and frequency in the teaching of the Church. Where, on the other hand, the distinguishing tenet is not found outside the limits of a particular society, the presumption is that it is new, and therefore, unless attested by miracle, false ; since, if it were part of the original deposit of Christianity, it is well-nigh impossible that it should not be discoverable at an earlier time and in a wider area.

XVIII. There is, however, another form of departure from

primitive truth, besides that of defect, which might be held to justify withdrawal from the fellowship of the Church.

There may be error on the side of excess, the imposition of doctrines unknown to the first ages of Christianity, and enforced as matters of faith upon the conscience. It is quite conceivable that a religious society, without formally setting aside any tenet of ancient Christendom, might yet so overlay and encrust it as practically to banish it from sight and memory; if not indeed to suggest a conflicting theory which might develop into direct contradiction. Here, again, it would be necessary to make an explicit and definite charge, pointing out in what particular the Church of England has attempted to force upon consciences any doctrine unknown to the teachers of the early Christian ages. It would be of no avail for this purpose to urge that such modern teaching can, as a matter of fact, be found in the writings of many Anglican ecclesiastics, nor even that their conduct has been unrebuked. To form a plausible ground for separation, nothing short of proof that the disputed tenets in question, whatever they may be, are in fact not only embodied in the authoritative formularies of the Church, but are so embodied as to bind the conscience, will avail to establish the indictment. And here at once inquiry may be challenged fearlessly, since, although without doubt the Church of England holds several doctrines which are rejected by the societies surrounding her, a very brief inquiry, if honestly pursued, will show, by a comparison of early Christian documents, that the Church of England does not err by excess in retaining these tenets, but that the sects err by defect in discarding them. And as the articles of belief maintained by the Church of England are more numerous than those held by the majority of the sects, there is, to say the least, a risk that the members of any sect learn but an imperfect Gospel, lacking in some of the elements of the faith once delivered to the saints.

XIX. So far, the case has been stated as against the sects. It must now be stated for the Church of England. That Church is not only by far the oldest religious society in this country, but dates back in historical continuity to the Church of primitive times. We do not know precisely when Christianity was first planted in Britain, but we do know that British bishops sat in the synods of the Church more than 1500 years ago, as the representatives of a body which was not new even then. When our heathen Saxon forefathers conquered Britain, and made it into England, they extirpated Christianity throughout most of the island, driving the ancient

remnant of the Christian Church into the fastnesses of Wales, where it continued to hold its ground. Somewhat later, Saxon heathenism was attacked by Christian missionaries from two different quarters, working in two different parts of the island. In the south, the Roman Church sent the missionary Augustine into Kent, where he founded the Church of Canterbury. In the north, the Irish Church sent out other missionaries, who worked chiefly in Northumberland and the neighbouring regions. These three separate organisations, northern, southern, and western, gradually blended into one, and formed, in their totality, the Church of England; the bishops and clergy of each and all of them having alike derived their doctrine and their commission from the undivided Church of yet earlier times, and not attempting to exist side by side as separate and rival communions. This Church, then, represents to all English citizens the original Society set up on earth by our Lord Himself, not as being the whole of that Society, but the particular portion of it which, in the course of Divine providence, was permitted to root itself in and spread over this land of England. It is this Church which has done *all* the work for Christ which has been done in this country for at least thirteen hundred years, and *most* of what has been done for three hundred years more. For this reason, if for no other, the responsibility of setting up rival bodies, designed to thwart, instead of aiding, its work in this country, is an extremely grave one. The whole tenour of both the Old and New Testament would teach us that the duty of earnest Christians who saw much to regret and disapprove in the teaching or practice of the Church, would be to remain in it and endeavour its reform; not to break away from it, and set up societies of their own invention, which must be in this respect, at any rate, contrary to the will of God.

XX. There are two circumstances of no little weight and importance which go far to show the unreasonableness of modern Dissent. The first is, that in a large number of cases the modern sects have openly or tacitly abandoned as untenable the grounds for adopting Nonconformity taken up by their forefathers. An episcopal ministry, the use of the surplice, the employment of set forms of prayer, kneeling at the Communion, the ring in marriage, and similar points, were among the chief objections raised by English Puritans 300 years ago against the Church, and more than one sect owes its origin to separation for such reasons. But now their temper has so far changed that they for the most part regard these matters as but trifling, and in not a few instances

actually adopt them as praiseworthy. By taking either of these courses, they practically admit that their original separation on such grounds was unjustifiable, and, therefore, that there is no good reason for continuing it now. There are other forms of Dissent which had a more respectable origin ; which were due to apathy, coldness, and unspirituality within the Church, and to the desire of finding something which would deal more effectually with the needs of souls than did the ministrations of the Establishment. The Methodist body is the most noticeable of those which arose in this fashion. But here, again, the teaching of history shows that they, too, were wrong. Their faith, however sincere, was clearly weak and imperfect, since otherwise they would have recognised that our Lord's teaching, and that of the Apostles, on the visible unity of the Church, and on the sin of making divisions from it, is quite as plainly laid down in the New Testament as any one of the doctrines which they desired to revive and enforce ; and, indeed, far more explicitly than several of those doctrines. Their aim was to set up a body which should contain none but true believers of holy life ; a beautiful dream, which has never been realised, and which, had it been realised, would have been quite unlike the Church on earth as revealed to us in the Gospel, under the figure of a net including both good and bad fishes. Thus, not recognising the Church as a Divine institution, they failed even to hope for any marked amendment or recovery within it, viewing it as a city of destruction, out of which they needed to flee to a Zoar of their own. But, as a fact, the Church did recover, and that in so conspicuous and unmistakable a degree, that for a long period of years it has been absolutely impossible for any Nonconformist sects to point truthfully to it as a warning to be shunned, or to plume themselves on any spiritual superiority over the Church manifested by their own adherents. And hence we may fairly draw the conclusion that had the religious activity which was too hastily diverted into the narrow channels of the sects been suffered to flow naturally within the banks of the Church, the flood of spiritual vitality would have fertilised the land far more than under existing conditions. There can be no doubt that had John Wesley lived in the present day, he would never have thought it necessary to establish an organisation in the least resembling the Methodist society ; though his zeal and devotion would have undoubtedly found abundant means of expression and activity in promoting further internal reforms. And thus, as the reason for the Methodist separation has ceased to exist, its

continued maintenance is in opposition to the will of God, even if its original formation be excused and condoned.

XXI. There is yet another particular in which the Church of England, apart from its lofty claims, ought to prove attractive to the finest religious minds in the country; which is that it is favourably distinguished from all its rivals, without exception, by its readiness to learn and willingness to reform. That there are defects and abuses in it still, inevitably resulting from its human element, is doubtless true; but that steady progress has been made for the last half century in the path of improvement, and that the abuses which still survive are doomed to speedy extinction, no clear-sighted observer can doubt. No one who will compare the Church of England as it was when this century began, and as it is now, can fail to recognise a change so great, deep, and salutary, as is inexplicable on any theory save that of divine suggestion and aid. It is simply impossible to match and parallel this revival by any similar movement discoverable in any of the other religious bodies in the country. Whatever may have been the growth of any one amongst them in numbers and material prosperity, none of them has exhibited the same humility in acknowledging shortcomings, the same zeal in pursuing amendment, the same revival of spiritual vitality in every muscle and vein. And this, be it observed, not in the way by which newly awakened interest in spiritual matters displays itself in Nonconformist societies. Amongst them, such a quickening nearly always results in the formation of a *new sect*, an experimental trial of some new panacea for spiritual evils. In the Church of England, on the other hand, the marvellous revival has been entirely due to the enforcement of *old* methods and principles inherent in her organisation, and embodied in her formularies, but which had been suffered to lie neglected and covered with rust, during a time of spiritual apathy. Thus, in short, a Nonconformist revival generally ends in persuading the revivalists that their society has been on the wrong track hitherto, and that they must leave it in order to find the right one; whereas the Church revival has proved to England that the Church was in the right all along, and that it was only failure to keep up to its standard which caused the abuses that are now being swept away.

XXII. Up to this time we have been considering the relation of the Church of England to those self-constituted bodies which are younger than she, and can trace their parentage no further back than the Reformation. But there is a more important rival in the field, with a far more ancient pedigree and

loftier claims, which declares that all the arguments adduced above against the sects of Protestantism apply equally to the Church of England, as being merely one of those sects, and equally in rebellion against the One Church, that of Rome. It is therefore necessary to state briefly the reasons which refute this charge. Foremost amongst them stands the indisputable fact that the Church of England is markedly like the Church of Rome in several of the particulars in which they are both unlike the Nonconformist sects. The hierarchy of Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons, and so forth, is similar in the two bodies; the Book of Common Prayer, in all its main features, is but an abridged arrangement and translation of the Latin Missal and Breviary; the doctrinal system of the two has an immense mass of matter absolutely in common, while the points of divergence, however serious and specific, are few in number, and in bulk are insignificant when compared with the great body of agreement. Thus, if the Anglican body be not really a Church, it is at any rate extraordinarily like one. And that Roman Catholic controversialists are fully aware of this likeness, may be judged from one very pregnant fact, namely, that the Church of England is the only religious body in the world, with the single exception of the Eastern Church, against which they trouble themselves to argue seriously. They simply do not think it worth their while, either here or on the Continent, to refute the claims of the Protestant sects, no matter how powerful those sects may be. They no more think of setting themselves to prove that Lutheran or Calvinist pastors are not lawful ministers of the true Church, holding sound doctrine, than the law-officers of the Crown in this country would dream of prosecuting for high treason any crazy person who claimed to have a better legal right to the throne of Great Britain than the Queen has. But they treat the Church of England exactly as they treat the Church of Constantinople and of Russia, arguing against both with a persistent anxiety which proves that they are afraid of them, and think their case only too good.

As they cannot deny that the chief religious body in England was a Church, and not a sect, down to the Reformation, they are obliged to allege that some change passed over it then which destroyed its Church character. And, broadly speaking, there were only two changes of so much importance as to amount, even in appearance, to this, for the cavils against the validity of Anglican Orders cannot be regarded as other than consciously insincere, if only from the entirely different grounds of objection taken up by successive genera-

tions of controversialists. These changes are the rejection of the Pope's jurisdiction and the alterations made in the Liturgy. But it is easy to show that just these two very things have been done in kind by other Churches, without destroying their character, even in Ultramontane eyes. Thus, for example, there is a well-known and very weighty institution at Rome, called the Congregation of the Index, established by the Council of Trent, and acting under the Pope's authority, which undertakes the censorship of books, and forbids, under stringent penalties, the perusal of such as it pronounces heretical. Nothing can have fuller Papal sanction than this Index, which concerns a very practical and important sphere of ecclesiastical discipline, but the French Church has never permitted it to exercise its powers in France, and rejects so far the Pope's authority, in a particular respecting which the claims of Rome have always been very precise and imperative. And as to liturgical reform, scores of French dioceses in the last century abrogated the use of the Roman Breviary, compiling in its stead new office-books of their own, in which the Scriptural element was largely increased, and the legendary and doubtful matter still more largely diminished. Yet these two acts of resistance have never been held to have in any degree unchurched the communion which committed them, nor to have even in any degree involved the assumption of rights to which it had no just title. The Church of England has done nothing which in principle goes beyond these measures of the Church of France, although in extent its independence of action has proceeded further. But it is precisely the question of principle which is in debate, and not that of degree, because the ground habitually taken up by Roman controversialists is the unlawfulness of any national Church presuming to settle liturgical and disciplinary questions for itself, apart from the sanction of the Holy See.

It is perfectly true that there was much profanity, sacrilege, and wanton destruction committed during the crisis of the Reformation in England; and had the extreme reformers been able to carry out their plans, they would have wrecked the Church as completely as they did in Scotland, where a new and human system was set up with an entirely novel and human organisation. But the fact is, that their scheme failed, and the mischief they were able to do did not touch essentials, but only details of ornament, more or less beautiful and edifying, too many of which had doubtless been distorted into error; just as an ancient castle or church may be restored in modern times, often not in the best taste and with some in-

jury to its beauty, and yet unavoidably, to avert utter ruin, but does not thereby lose its identity. And, at the worst, none of the leaders sank so far as those archbishops, bishops, and clergy of the French Church who made open profession of atheism at the Revolution; besides which, whatever the Reformers were, they were the children of the unreformed Church, which is accountable for them. The broad and complete answer to the whole argument is that, at this moment, Christianity has a firmer hold on the people of England, including the educated and cultured classes, than it has in any Roman Catholic country of similar extent and influence.

XXIII. If the Church of England, in reforming itself from doctrinal and practical abuses, had either abandoned the old hierarchy altogether, and set up an entirely new pastorate, as was the case amongst the German Lutherans and Scotch Calvinists; or if only a small minority of the clerical body had assented to the Reformation, forcibly excluding by means of the civil power those who adhered to the former state of things, it might be possible to argue with some plausibility, that either of these courses had in fact unchurched the communion which was guilty of following it. But so far from this having been the case, the episcopal succession has been more carefully preserved in the Church of England than in any other part of Western Christendom, since deviation from the Nicene rule which enjoins a minimum of three consecrators for each new bishop has been scarcely ever, if at all, permitted in this country; whereas in the Roman communion consecration at the hands of a single prelate has been extremely common, and has necessarily left the validity of the rite too often open to cavil. In the next place, as regards the adhesion of the Anglican clergy to the Reformation, it is enough to say that at the Ecclesiastical Visitation of 1559, out of a body of clergy numbering between nine and ten thousand, only 180 refused to accept the reformed offices. When more than 98 per cent. of a body remains in possession of that which it enjoyed before the occurrence of any crisis, it is clear that on any ground of law or history the continuity of the body vests in that majority, and not in the two per cent. of remonstrants, unless indeed the majority had committed some act of corporate suicide, either by abandoning the faith of Christendom, or by setting up an entirely new and purely human organisation; neither of which events, on any reading of the facts, has taken place in England. Of course, if the English Church had apostatised from Christianity, or if a mere lay pastorate had been substituted, as in Scotland, for the

Apostolic ministry, the title of Church of England would either have been forfeited altogether, or have belonged exclusively to the protesting minority. But failing either of these grounds of forfeiture, no person or society external to the Church of England had then, or has now, a right of interference. The mere fact that one Church has been instrumental in founding another, does not give the elder and vaster communion any claim to regulate the internal affairs of the daughter society. So, for example, the Church of England does not claim authority over the daughter Church of America, nor arrogate for the English Primate jurisdiction over its dioceses, although in any joint assembly of bishops of the Anglican communion the Archbishop of Canterbury would have priority of rank universally conceded to him. But, if not content with this honorary precedence, he were to send English bishops and clergy, owing canonical obedience to him, to set up a society in the United States to rival the Church there, this society would be junior to the local Church in point of time, and irregular in point of order, so that, albeit derived, and that more immediately, from the English Church than the Church of America is, it would be an intruder without defensible status; which is exactly the position of the branch of the Roman Church now existing in England, which, as a fully organised community, is not thirty years old, as compared with the twelve or sixteen hundred years of the National Church.

XXIV. The Roman plea, however, is that the mere fact of being out of communion with the Pope and separating from the Church of which he is the recognised head, is itself destructive of all Church character. The answer is, that even if this were true—which the occurrence as saints in the Roman Calendar of some who, like S. Cyprian, died out of communion with the Pope; the rival parties in the Great Schism, with saints on each side; and the deposition of Popes by Councils, disprove—the Church of England has not separated from the Church of Rome, but the Church of Rome has separated from the Church of England. That is to say, the Church of England has laid down in the most formal manner in the Thirtieth Canon of 1603 that no such act of separation on its part has taken place at all. This statement is embodied in the following words:—

‘So far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of *Italy*, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies, which doth neither endamage

the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they had fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders.

In the next place, the Church of England has nowhere embodied in its formularies any anathemas against the Church of Rome, and a mere subscription to the XXXIX. Articles is sufficient to give any Roman bishop, priest, or deacon full ecclesiastical status among the Anglican clergy; whereas no minister of a Protestant sect can obtain that character by any means short of submitting to episcopal ordination. The conduct of the Church of Rome, on the other hand, towards the Church of England is the reverse of this in all respects; so that a separation between the two does exist, the blame of which, on the face of things, rests with the foreign body.

XXV. The question therefore arises, whether this be really so, or whether the Church of England is to blame for having even seemed to separate originally on inadequate grounds, or for taking no active steps to end that practical separation which is now apparent, but remaining in a position of isolation for reasons which no longer apply. As regards the first of these questions, it is enough to say that for nearly one hundred and fifty years before the Reformation almost all the most illustrious divines of the Western Church, whether singly, as members of joint committees, or as constituents of great Church Synods, urged in the strongest language the imperative need of a very sweeping measure of reform in every department of ecclesiastical affairs. But their remonstrances and demands were alike unheeded by the Roman Court, and it was not until after the Reformation had taken place and had caused the division of Western Christendom, that the Council of Trent was assembled, and proceeded to the task of practical reforms. Had this Council never sat, or had it parted without making any substantial changes, Roman Catholics might possibly deny that any scandals and abuses existed, save in the imagination of their opponents; but by taking so many of them in hand as was done at Trent, full confession of guilt and responsibility was made, only that it came too late to recover those whom the persistence of the Roman Court in upholding evil had revolted.

There is little doubt that had the reforms of Trent been conceded forty years earlier, the Reformation would either have never taken place at all or would have been confined to a narrow area and to insignificant results. No question can arise in the mind of any impartial student of Church history

that the original ground of breach with the Roman Court was adequate, since that Court was the one steadfast enemy of amendment; though it is impossible to defend the personal conduct of the seceders in many other subsequent matters. But it may fairly be asked why it did not become the Church of England's duty to return into communion with Rome after the Council of Trent, just as it is alleged above that the Methodists are bound to return to the revived and quickened Church of England of to-day, so unlike that from which they parted during the apathy of the last century.

XXVI. The answer to this question, is that the Council of Trent was largely made abortive by various intrigues, so that much of its original programme was defeated, and although things were made far more tolerable than they had previously been for members of the Roman Church, they were yet not made sufficiently so, nor placed on a sufficiently secure basis, to warrant the return of the seceders. To put the matter briefly, the Church of Rome then, and ever since, has laid down unjust and unscriptural terms of communion, as the only ones upon which it will receive Christians of other societies into its fold. All that the Church of England demands is acceptance of the Creeds, and submission to the rites of Baptism and Confirmation in the case of the unbaptized or unconfirmed in the case of laymen—including under this head all non-Episcopal ministers and pastors—while, as already observed, signature of the Thirty-nine Articles is alone required of duly-ordained ecclesiastics wishing to join its communion.

But the Roman Church compels every lay person within its pale to disobey the command of the Lord Jesus Christ as to the cup of the New Testament, 'Drink ye *all* of it,' a command whose binding character has been recognised from the first by the yet more ancient Eastern Church, and which was not formally set aside, even by Rome itself, till about one hundred years prior to the Reformation—to be exact, on June 15, 1415, in the Council of Constance. If the practical teaching of the Roman Church were only that when, for some valid reasons, the Holy Eucharist can be administered to any person in one kind only, the full grace of both kinds will be received thereby, no reasonable objection could be raised; but to forbid in express terms obedience to Christ, and to defend such a forbidding by a mere charitable hypothesis—in other words, by a guess at the possible secret counsel of God—is clearly more than enough to repel any layman, and to make it his duty not to join a communion which forces upon him disobedience to God.

The arguments customarily adduced by Roman controversialists in defence of this usage do not amount to much, for they are chiefly based on a supposed risk of irreverence and profanation involved in the general bestowal of the chalice. But this is to be wiser than Christ Himself, Who must have foreseen all results which would flow from His own command, and is to avert from Him what He therefore designed to undergo. At best, it is S. Peter's conduct when he was told of the coming Passion: 'Then Peter took Him, and began to rebuke Him, saying, Be it far from Thee, Lord: this shall not be unto Thee;' whereby he did but earn the stern rebuke: 'Get thee behind Me, Satan, thou art an offence unto Me, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.' (S. Matt. xvi. 22, 23.)

Nor does the difficulty of embracing the Roman system cease here. There are in fact two distinct and even contrariant religions co-existing in the Roman Church of to-day: the one, formal, fixed, and authoritative, embodied in the Breviary and Missal, not varying very essentially from that set forth by the English Book of Common Prayer. But this religion is embodied in books entirely written in a dead language, and is in practice exclusively confined to the clergy.

The religion tendered to the laity is of a very different character, and, to say the least, startlingly unlike the Christianity of the New Testament; consisting very largely, in many countries almost entirely, of devotions in which God and Christ are practically banished into the background, while the prayers of the people are directed preferably to merely human personages. Unlike the devotions of the Breviary and Missal, in which the Saints occupy a wholly subordinate position, these popular cults, sedulously promoted by the highest authorities, are not logically distinguishable, nor in fact are they distinguished by illiterate minds, from the acknowledgment of the Saints as independent sources of grace and blessing, and as being on the whole the most convenient and desirable objects of frequent devotional address. One example will suffice as an illustration. In a devout book, containing much excellent matter, and intended for the use of nuns, called 'The Spouse of Christ,' itself compiled by a Poor Clare, and issued under episcopal sanction, may be found towards the close of nearly every chapter two brief ejaculations, immediately following one another. The first is 'My Jesus, mercy;' the second, 'Sweet Heart of Mary, be my salvation.' Not only is the latter a more direct prayer, in the full sense, as addressed to a divine object, than

the former, but on each occurrence their relative spiritual value is marked in brackets, telling us that the prayer to our Lord is privileged by the Pope with one hundred days' indulgence, while that to the heart of His Mother is similarly endowed with three hundred days, the logical and inevitable conclusion from which to every reader of the book must needs be that prayer to the Blessed Virgin is just three times as efficacious and profitable as prayer to the Eternal Word. It is true that the Mass, still technically the central devotion of the Roman Church, is not open to objection on this ground ; but, on the one hand, it is in a dead language, not in the vernacular, like the popular services ; and, on the other, the well-nigh universal custom of the laity not attempting to follow it, much less to respond congregationally where directed so to do, but employing private manuals of prayer simultaneously, deprives it of almost its whole teaching value, and makes not only possible, but frequent, the habitual use of unauthorised devotions, pitched in an altogether lower key, and by no means barred against the fault just named. Besides this serious objection, there stands also the fact that, within the last few years there has been an extraordinary revival of precisely those mechanical and superstitious observances which largely tended to bring about the Reformation, and which were, therefore, steadily discountenanced for a considerable time after that event by the authorities of the Roman Church, in view of the scandal which they had occasioned. But the same authorities have lately, for a long continuous period, actively encouraged the restoration of these very practices ; so that the religious observances most commonly set before devout Roman Catholics, as likely to be of spiritual benefit to them, consist in such things as visits to holy wells, such as Lourdes, pilgrimages to the sites of most questionable apparitions, as La Salette and Paray-le-Monial, bearing about the person pieces of consecrated thread or cloth, such as the Cord of S. Francis and the Scapular, to the mere contact of which miraculous powers of grace are ascribed ; and solemn devotions in honour of more than doubtful relics, like the Blessed Virgin's girdle at Quintin, and the Holy Candle of Arras ; all of them practices which can be paralleled with ease in several Pagan systems, but for which no colourable defence is discoverable in the Scriptures of either the Old or the New Testament. On the face of things, therefore, the Roman Church presents such extraordinary difficulties, from its plain incompatibility with the doctrine and practice of the Primitive Church, as

discoverable either in Scripture or history, that it cannot for a moment prove its claim to be the true representative of pure Christianity in this country; even without laying particular stress on the fact, that as a fully organised religious communion, its age in England is under thirty years; for the mediæval Church here, though in communion with Rome, was the real Church of England, and not a mere piece of the Roman Church localised in England, analogous to the Anglican see of Gibraltar, which is a piece of the English Church localised in Spain, but no part of the Spanish Church. That is to say, the modern Anglo-Roman Church exists merely as an offshoot of the local Church of Rome, with no character of independence or nationality. Its one distinguishing reason for existing at all is communion with the Pope and exact submission to him; it is compelled to refer most questions which may arise within it to tribunals at Rome, and is not suffered to deal with them on its own authority; it is governed by Roman Canon Law, and uses the Roman Missal and Breviary with Roman ceremonial. On the other hand, the mediæval Church of England, though in communion with the Pope, treated such communion as a mere subordinate detail of its constitution, for it frequently resisted him, and sometimes defied him; it had its own Canon Law, never receiving the Roman Canon Law as valid here; but passing its own Canons without seeking foreign confirmation for them; it claimed and exercised authority to decide all its own internal business, for appeals to Rome, though not infrequent, were voluntary, and not compulsory; it had its own Missals and Breviaries, with a national ceremonial; and thus, in all these noticeable points, was at open variance with the modern importation which lays claim to its titles.

XXVII. Nor do the difficulties in the way of submitting to the Roman Church cease here. There are reasons why even clergymen, who could avail themselves of the comparatively pure religion of the Breviary and Missal, and personally refrain from participating in the coarser forms of popular devotion, nevertheless cannot justifiably attach themselves to the existing Roman Church. The chief reason is that, as the discipline of that Church makes it perfectly feasible, nay easy, for its higher authorities to suppress any false teaching or superstitious practice within its pale, and yet they refuse to do so, it follows that to join them, while such is the case, is to condone their misconduct and voluntarily to assume a full share of responsibility for it in a far greater degree than hereditary Roman Catholics, who have accepted

without question the system in which they were born, and have not given in their adhesion by any voluntary and independent act. Just so, if this country were engaged in an unrighteous war against some foreign State, there would be a wide difference between the moral position of officers holding commissions in the army or navy, who, in obedience to orders from superiors, took part in carrying on that war, and that of foreign volunteers, who, having no concern in the matter, offered themselves as combatants on the aggressive side. It may be fairly urged that the conduct of the former, in holding that they had no right to canvass the orders of their government, has a very great deal to be said for it, and the strictest moralist would not hold them responsible for the misdoings of their State in the original quarrel. But a volunteer, bound by no duty in the matter, would be justly held as guilty of wrong-doing as the State whose cause he had of his own free will embraced ; just as, to cite a contemporary example, the culpability of Hobart Pasha in the Cretan massacre during the insurrection was incomparably greater than that of any Turkish officer employed.

XXVIII. Further, the office of the Church, in so far as it is the keeper and witness of Holy Writ, is to provide as high a degree of certainty as the nature of the case allows, touching faith, discipline, and morals. But it is the misfortune and the peculiarity of the Roman Church, that there is at the present moment much less certainty, and less security, within its pale on these three heads, than in almost any other Christian community. As regards faith, the position formerly was that the Church rested its teaching on the twofold basis of Scripture and Tradition, that is to say, historical evidence ; and an authoritative pledge is still required from every Roman Catholic priest at his ordination, and from every convert at his reception, that he will interpret Scripture no otherwise than in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers. But by the revolution effected in the Vatican Council of 1870, which attributed the character of infallibility to the Pope, the two bases of Scripture and Tradition have been swept away, and the Faith has been made to depend on the momentary caprice of a single man. Even sixteen years before he was declared infallible, Pius IX., on his own responsibility, erected into a dogma, as an essential part of the Roman faith, the tenet of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, which up to that time had not only been a mere tolerated opinion, which it was permissible to disbelieve, but one which is con-

tradicted by the well-nigh unanimous consent of all the Fathers who had any occasion to glance at the subject; and which, therefore, was not lawfully tenable on Roman principles, albeit widely prevalent, before 1854. The power which can make a new dogma in this fashion can of course unmake old ones, and thus there is no security that a wicked and unbelieving Pope (and even Ultramontanes do not yet deny the possibility of another such in the future as there have been several in the past) may not condemn the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation; and by means of the vast powers conferred upon him, force this infidel teaching upon the Latin Church in general, by depriving all bishops who will not teach, and compel their clergy to teach, under similar pain of deprivation, these same errors. And if it be replied, as of course it will be, that such a catastrophe is wildly improbable, yet a mitigated but perilous form of it is more than likely to occur. It is as yet the formally accredited opinion in the Roman Church that the Pope is infallible only when avowedly teaching the whole Church as Universal Doctor. As a private theologian, or when teaching no more than a part of the Church, he may err. But not only does he possess enormous powers, as just mentioned, which enable him to force his private error, supposing him to fall into it, on every several diocese of the Latin obedience, but the moral difficulty of asserting his fallibility in any one conceivable instance is indefinitely great. There is always the retort possible against any remonstrance, that men who are always fallible have no right to canvass or question the decisions of a man who is sometimes infallible, and whom a very powerful body, constituting a practical majority, of his subjects alleges to be always infallible. It would soon become the invariable custom to give the Pope the benefit of the doubt, and to treat any hesitation in compliance as perilously rash, if not as formally heretical, and thus any error in faith or morals which he might promulgate as a private doctor, would not only be accepted as divinely revealed truth by a great part of the Latin Church, but would be silently acquiesced in as irresistible by nearly all the remainder, leaving the units who still ventured to remonstrate in the seeming position of heretics. And, as a fact, such errors in faith and morals have been taught by Popes in the past, so that there is no warrant for assuming that they will not recur. That this peril is not imaginary, but even imminent, may be shown by one modern and palmary example of a total change of front in respect of a heresy. In 1687, Innocent XI. rightly

condemned by the Constitution *Cælestis Pastor* sixty-eight Quietist theses of Michael Molinos, who died in 1696 a prisoner of the Inquisition at Rome. In 1864, Pius IX. beatified Margaret Mary Alacoque, whose teaching on all the most objectionable points of Quietism is even verbally identical with that of Molinos, but is now formally authorised in connexion with the Nestorian cult of the Sacred Heart.

As regards matters of discipline, inclusive of the administration of Sacraments, the doctrine of Intention, currently taught in the Roman Church, according to which the validity of any outward spiritual act depends on the inward consent of the officiant, makes it impossible to be certain that any Sacrament whatsoever is validly received at any given time. The penitent cannot be sure that he has received absolution; the communicant cannot be sure that he has received the Eucharist; the candidate for Holy Orders cannot be sure that he is really ordained. And in the third place, as regards morals, the elevation of Alphonso Liguori, by Pius IX., to be a Doctor of the Universal Church, has raised his teaching to a position of unassailable authority, in that it not only may not be openly contradicted, but must be followed, especially in the confessional; which teaching is not only itself of the very laxest kind on all moral questions, but is the chief bulwark of the principle known as Probabilism; according to which it is permissible to follow the less probable of two opinions respecting the observance of any law whose own obligation is unquestionable. The practical working of this may be illustrated by saying, that if the question be on the observance of the eighth commandment, and that one teacher lay down that the commandment means exactly what it says, so that no kind of stealing is permissible; while another contend that the sole intention of the commandment being to prevent injury to one's neighbour, it is not a sin to steal from him something whose loss he does not feel; it becomes lawful to act on this second opinion, and to steal small sums from rich men. And as Probabilism applies to all kinds of moral obligation, and is now the accepted doctrine of the Roman Church, it follows that there is no certainty for morals. In this wise, the Roman Church, though preserving the outward organisation which makes it an integral part of the Church Universal, and for the time retaining the whole body of Christian doctrine, albeit overlaid and obscured, has practically abdicated some of its most important functions, and no longer discharges the primary duties of a Church; while the further difficulty

exists, that there is no prospect of reform in these respects within any reasonable time, because the strict disciplinary system, of which its advocates boast so loudly, makes its higher authorities as able as they are willing to silence, or expel, as they formerly burned, any persons bold enough to make a stand against popular abuses. And for all these reasons, and many more which space forbids to set down here, the Roman Church has forfeited any claims it might have had in this country, and is not, for Englishmen at any rate, the teacher appointed by God.

XXIX. A very few words will suffice to dispose of those societies which lay claim to a new revelation; to wit, the Irvingites, the Swedenborgians, and the Mormons.

As to the Irvingite body, its distinctive peculiarity is scarcely doctrinal at all; since it differs but little in its tenets from the Church of England, but it claims to have had restored to it, through a special revelation, the original Apostolic Ministry after an abeyance of seventeen hundred years. Two circumstances are sufficient to disprove its claim. In the first place, its origin is unlike that of any previous dispensation given by God to man, since in every former instance each fresh covenant was made with the members of the then existing Church, and was a development of its organisation. Thus, the Church of which Abraham was the first representative grew out of the Noachic Church; the Mosaic Church, in its turn, did but develop the Abrahamic Covenant; and the Christian Church, in like manner, grew out of Mosaism. Accordingly, if a fourth instance of the kind were to be vouchsafed by God, the analogy of His dealings obliges us to expect that it would arise in some part or other of the old historical Catholic Churches, whether Eastern or Western. But, as a fact, Irvingism arose in the modern Protestant sect of Scottish Presbyterianism, of which it is in no sense even a development, but a contradiction. And in the next place, the only proof which has ever been tendered in support of its genuineness, is an alleged private outpouring of the gift of tongues on its earliest disciples. But whereas S. Paul lays down the principle that 'tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not' (1 Cor. xiv. 22), these alleged portents, on the contrary, were strictly confined to the inner circle of believers, and are never publicly manifested for the conversion of outsiders. It will be time enough, when such patent proof is offered, to examine the pretensions of this sect with any seriousness, especially since it has made no progress for many years, but is a

fast dwindling body ; while ten out of the twelve persons whom it styled Apostles have died without producing a Peter, a John, or a Paul, or even making any notable missionary efforts, and the survivors, both of them aged and feeble, and withdrawn from all active exertion, are unknown even by name outside the limits of the sect—no great results for nearly half a century of existence. Two other circumstances, were further disproof necessary, might be alleged : first, that the authorities of the Irvingite body permit, nay, encourage, their members to avail themselves of the spiritual ministrations of the clergy of the old historical Churches, and even, if we do not mistake, of those of the pastors of certain Protestant denominations, such as the Lutherans and Presbyterians, when their own officers are not accessible ; and, next, that the sect is almost exclusively English, since a few German and some American congregations make up nearly the whole of the society outside the limits of the United Kingdom. The former of these facts shows that the new or revived ministry is not essential, but only complementary and ornamental, even in the eyes of its advocates ; while the second is a practical disproof of the Catholic claims of a body which has been unable to spread itself beyond a meretribal boundary—unlike the true Apostolic college, which in a much shorter period had overleaped the barriers of Judaism and begun to disciple the whole Roman Empire, and not a few regions beyond. As regards the Swedenborgians, who avow themselves to be a 'New Church,' and therefore make no *historical* claims whatever, they have not even the quasi-miracles of Irvingism to produce on their behalf ; besides which, they have departed far more widely from ancient Christian doctrine, being heterodox on the Trinity, the Atonement, the Resurrection, and the Second Advent ; in all which particulars, except the first, their tenets are new, while their view of the first is a reproduction of ancient Sabellianism. Much of Swedenborg's teaching is, no doubt, mere ingenious and innocuous speculation, by no means devoid of suggestiveness, but so far as it claims to be a revelation, it is 'another gospel,' and one which can adduce no testimony in its favour. And it entirely lacks the necessary tokens either of Divine approval or of general suitability to the spiritual needs of man. It has existed now for nearly one hundred years, for just ninety as a separate organisation since its meetings for worship began in 1787 ; and yet its numbers only reach about ten thousand in all the world, almost exclusively confined (like the Irvingites) to a lower middle-class stratum of society in England and America, thus

being a mere class-religion of a single race, not a Catholic faith for the whole world, nor does it exhibit the least vitality in growth, and must therefore be regarded as a complete failure. For Mormonism, it is enough to say that besides the puerility and ignorance of the Book of Mormon, the notorious and fully established crimes and profligacy which have marked the sect from the beginning, show that it has no divine character about it, but is a mere imposture without claim to attention, a remark which holds good of several other modern American sects of immoral character.

XXX. In sum, the Church of England is the only religious society in this country which, in the good pleasure of God, is brought home to the notice of every inhabitant of England; it is the only one which descends by direct and unbroken pedigree from the Christian body which existed here in the time of undivided Christendom; it is the only one in which it is feasible to teach the whole Catholic faith, as it was held in primitive ages, without addition or subtraction; it is the only one which gives, and is bound to give, its services everywhere, and to all, without money and without price, since it maintains itself on its own revenues; it is the only one which has set itself vigorously to amend and reform defects and abuses which had crept into its system; it is the only one which does not insist that its members should hold only some Divine truths, and should reject others equally Divine, because difficult of combination; it is the only one which, resting its teaching on Scripture and History, can offer any assurance of certainty or permanence to its adherents. It is not a perfect Church; it has still many spots and wrinkles; it is still in many particulars deformed and outraged by the State, which affects to endow it with special privileges, but really visits it with peculiar disabilities; it has unfaithful children amongst both its clergy and people; but it is curing itself of its faults, day by day, and is doing a greater work for God in the land than any other Society can pretend to; so that it is incomparably better worth while for those outside to enter into it, and lend their efforts to make it a glory in the earth, than to remain outside and thwart its labours, as members of societies which have fallen away more or less from the faith, and which, in their spiritual pride, refuse to believe that they have any need to mend their ways.

ART. III.—THE LIFE OF COUNT CAVOUR.

The Life of Count Cavour. From the French of M. CHARLES DE MAZADE. (London, 1877.)

M. DE MAZADE has long been honourably known as a prominent contributor to the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, in which the work before us originally appeared. And he has done a good service to history by republishing his series of articles in a collected form. The work can hardly be called a 'Life,' since it is but a sketch of the great Minister's political career for the last thirteen years of his life. But, though we would gladly have learnt more of his youth and early manhood than can be collected from the very brief notice here vouchsafed to them, yet, even thus limited, the volume is of great value.

Cavour has certainly claims to be considered one of the most remarkable men, if not the most remarkable, of his age. He may be said to have created not only a kingdom, but a people. Before his day there were Piedmontese, Lombards, Venetians, Tuscans, Romans, Neapolitans; but no one nation of Italians. The Venetians hated the Romans; the Piedmontese despised the Neapolitans. And if at times a patriotic indignation prompted the prayer of minstrel or orator, that either the land might become less beautiful and alluring, or its sons more vigorous to defend it, yet neither the poetic inspiration of Filicaja nor even the statesmanlike foresight of Machiavelli went beyond a desire to shake off the 'barbaro dominio' of French or Austrian. No one dreamt that the hour might come when but one sceptre, and that swayed by a native Prince, should be obeyed from the Alps to Cape Passaro; and when Italy, no longer a collection of petty states, torn by domestic faction when independent, and often handed over from one foreign master to another as prizes of conquest or make-weights in some treaty of alliance; but united, and strong in the new union, should take its place among the leading kingdoms of Western Europe, with an authoritative dignity, which even its former oppressors could not refuse to acknowledge.

It is to Cavour that the change is owing. Of this policy, he has had imitators, as he foresaw that he should have.

'I am setting an example which, some day, Prussia will be very happy to imitate,' was his reply to the Prussian Ambassador who had been instructed to remonstrate against the advance of General Cialdini on Ancona. And, as we all know, his prediction has been abundantly verified. But Bismarck's greatest admirers must confess that in raising Prussia to the eminence on which she now stands, he had far fewer and slighter obstacles to contend with than confronted his Italian prototype; and that no such wantonness of aggression stains the policy which brought Italy to solicit the sovereignty of Victor Emmanuel as has left Hanover and Schleswig-Holstein indelible blots on the escutcheon of Frederic William. Ancient as it may seem to men who live as rapidly as those of the latter half of the nineteenth century, the recollection of the share which Prussia had borne in the overthrow of the first Napoleon contributed in no trivial degree to her assumption, forty years afterwards, of the lead in the German Diet. But no past achievements promised similar influence to Sardinia. At the beginning of the century, she was the very first of the Transalpine States to be annexed to France, even before the great conqueror had exchanged the consulship for the Imperial sceptre; while the events of 1848, that year of revolutions, seemed to serve only to rivet the chains of Lombardy and other states in the same condition, so that Alison's comment on the decisive day of Novara is that it 'had determined probably for ages the cause of Italian independence.' The volume which contains this prophecy was published in the spring of 1859. The summer of the same year had not passed before the industrious but somewhat dogmatic historian saw reason to repent of the positiveness of his prediction; when duchy after duchy not as victims of conquest, but by the deliberate choice of its own citizens, voluntarily solicited the acceptance of their allegiance by the King of Sardinia. Taking M. de Mazade for our guide, we will endeavour to give such an idea as the very brief space at our disposal will permit, of the man who thus baffled the calculations of the student and overthrew the traditions of many generations.

Count Camillo Cavour, born at Turin on August 1, 1810, was the second son of the Marquis de Cavour, the head of one of the oldest families of the Piedmontese nobility. He was educated in the Military Academy, Turin, and at the age of eighteen joined a battalion of Engineers as a sub-lieutenant. For a year or two he was chiefly distinguished for his social accomplishments, and the zest with which he

entered into the pleasures of the different cities in which his corps was stationed. But his military life was of short duration. He took a keen interest in politics also ; and, when the French Revolution of 1830 drove the elder branch of the Bourbons from the throne, he expressed his approval of that movement with a warmth that gave great offence to his superiors, and led to his retirement from the army. He took to farming, showing great energy and no little skill in agricultural pursuits, and varying them with visits to France and England, in which, though at first his sympathies with the cause of which Louis Philippe seemed to be the representative led him to extend his admiration to that sovereign's Ministers, and to wish that any one would show him 'an English or a German Duc de Broglie,' a further insight into English institutions and the characters of English statesmen changed his opinions ; and Canning, and Peel, and above all Pitt, the great master of both, became the chief objects of his panegyrics, the models whom he apparently proposed to himself. In the great 'pilot who weathered the storm' he saw one who, though the champion of monarchy and religion, 'was no friend of despotism nor of intolerance, who was no doctrinaire, nor one of those men who aim at recasting society from top to bottom, with loose conceptions and humanitarian theories.' Later on, in 1847, he declared that 'Peel's reforms had been the salvation of England, that his country owed statues to him.' Already he fancied he saw an opening for impressing on his own countrymen the lessons which he had derived from a study of the career of these illustrious men.

For some years the spirit of reform had been unusually vehement in Western Europe, and in no country more than in Italy. Pius IX. himself, who had just succeeded to the triple crown, was understood to favour what were called liberal ideas. And the King of Sardinia, Charles Albert, showed an inclination to set an example to the other Italian states by the grant of many constitutional privileges to his subjects, which hitherto had been almost confined to our country, not concealing his hope that he might thus contribute in some degree to the 'sacred cause of Italian independence.' Cavour was eager to lend his aid to the movement, and exerted himself in a way which perhaps shows that he still leant to the traditions of the French politicians, whom a few years before he had so highly extolled. He established a newspaper, whose title, *Il Risorgimento*, sufficiently indicated his objects and his hopes ; while the articles which he published in it gave honourable proof of the thoroughly Conservative

character of his Liberalism, and from the first threw down the gauntlet to the advocates of 'revolutionary means,' as what could only 'wreck the very best of revolutions, and could be productive of nothing but discredit and ruin.' But the movement was premature. The military strength of Charles Albert could not, without foreign aid, measure itself against the force which the acute and watchful Metternich had long kept in readiness for such a struggle. And in the spring of 1849, the crushing defeat of Novara deprived Charles Albert himself of his crown, and for a time, Italy of her hopes. Piedmont had even to pay a heavy penalty for her enterprise in the form of a war indemnity of three millions sterling, a sum scarcely inferior to the yearly revenues of the kingdom.

But, even in this hour of darkness, there were brave hearts and far-seeing minds which did not despair of their country's future; and among the foremost of these was Cavour, whose influence over his fellow-citizens of Turin seemed as if it were augmented by the late catastrophe. Charles Albert had abdicated the throne in favour of his son, Victor Emmanuel, who inherited his political aspirations with a greater sagacity to carry them out, and a firmer if somewhat less impulsive disposition. In his eyes, Novara had not extinguished the hopes which had prompted the contest; it had but delayed their fulfilment; and Cavour was even more hopeful than he, and, amid all the disasters and distress of the moment, could still look forward to the re-establishment of prosperity in his native province, and with it, and rising from it, to the regeneration of the entire peninsula. The hopes which he felt, he taught his countrymen to share, so that at the next election to the Piedmontese Parliament the citizens of Turin placed him as their representative at the head of the poll. And in the autumn of 1850, on the death of the Minister of Commerce and Finance, the Prime Minister, Count Massimo d'Azeglio, requested the King's sanction to offer him the vacant portfolio. Victor Emmanuel gave the leave requested not unwillingly, for he knew his abilities; but at the same time warning d'Azeglio that the recruit whose assistance he desired would soon become his master.

The royal prophecy was not slow in being fulfilled. The Ministry had a hard task before it; but, in grappling with it, the conciliatory moderation of the Prime Minister was far from keeping up with the fiery energy of his subordinate. It was soon seen that there was a division in the Cabinet; and Cavour, already recognised as the leader of the party of decisive action, was naturally forced to yield to his superior

officer. He resigned his post, and, that he might in no degree embarrass his colleagues whom he loved and respected, even while most differing from them, he took another journey to France and England. In the one country, the *coup d'état* of December 1851 had just established the authority of Louis Napoleon on a seemingly solid foundation; in the other, Lord Derby's Ministry had lately displaced the Cabinet of Lord John Russell, and the seals of the Foreign Office had been entrusted to Lord Malmesbury. With both the French Emperor and the English Secretary of State, Cavour, now a private individual, had more than one interview, in which he found both inclined to entertain a high opinion of his talents, and some (though less openly pronounced) sympathy with his views. But he could not be long spared from Turin. D'Azeglio, though unable on all points to act with him, was still more unable to dispense with him, and, as the sole mode of escape from the difficulty, resigned his own office, and recommended him to Victor Emmanuel as his successor. And thus, in November 1852, Cavour became Prime Minister, with the enthusiastic applause of one party, and the not very reluctant, though somewhat doubtful, acquiescence of the other; while the King himself, though secretly leaning rather to the cautious policy of his former adviser, was not unwilling to be converted, his feelings taking the shape of doubts rather of the practicability of his new Minister's projects, than of their advantage to his nation and, to himself, if it should prove possible to execute them.

And, indeed, there was much in the condition of his kingdom to breed hesitation in the mind of a prince, who, though not without ambition, was sensitively alive to his responsibilities as ruler of a nation. His kingdom was not only poor, but it was encumbered with a debt, the interest of which absorbed a great proportion of the yearly revenue; while it was obvious that any attempt to realise the aspirations which animated the new Minister must add largely to the expenditure long before it augmented the means by which that expenditure could be met. Nor did Victor Emmanuel perceive the difficulties of the situation a whit more keenly than Cavour himself. And it was well that it was so; for no one ever surmounted difficulties who began by underrating them. Cavour saw them all, and grappled with them with a conviction that he could master them. He resolved to equalise the revenue and the expenditure, not by diminishing, but by increasing the latter, by devoting millions to opening the communications, improving the ports, and developing the

internal resources of the country. Remembering the example of Pitt, he stimulated commerce by treaties with foreign countries, hoping especially by such means to conciliate the good will, and, if need should arise, the active support of England and France. He had no doubt that measures such as these would soon prove remunerative. But he was not content with these; they would improve the internal prosperity of the kingdom, but they would not tend to its aggrandisement, and he looked further than the mere augmentation of the revenues of a nation which did not number five millions of people. He was prepared to spend still heavier sums on a policy which could yield no financial return, if he could thus place Piedmont in a higher position in the eyes of foreign statesmen. 'Piedmont' (he said) 'must begin by raising herself, by re-establishing in Europe, as well as in Italy, a position and a credit equal to her ambition.' And, even before he had become Minister, he had expressed to one of his intimate friends an expectation that complications were not unlikely to arise between the kingdoms of Eastern and Western Europe, which might afford to vigilant enterprise an opportunity such as he desired. His hopes were realised, perhaps even before he had expected. And when, in the spring of 1854, England and France declared war against Russia, he prepared at once to avail himself of the opportunity with a boldness which, when it succeeds, justly vindicates to itself the title of genius. He concluded an alliance with England and France, not on any such condition as England would have been willing to accept of furnishing a contingent to the allied armies to serve for British pay, but on equal terms as a third power, making, in proportion to its strength, equal exertions, and, as a consequence, acquiring equal rights.

The force which he sent under General La Marmora to join the English and French armies in the Crimea consisted of no more than 15,000 men; but the credit to Piedmont of appearing in the field as the ally of two such nations was not to be measured by the number of her troops. It was recognised everywhere as having raised Piedmont to a rank which she had never before reached, not even under the bravest or the most sagacious of her former sovereigns. If ever a policy was to be judged of by its fruits it was this. And the fruit was gathered with unusual promptitude. La Marmora reached the Crimea in May; in August he bore an honourable share in the fierce battle of the Tchernaya. And his country reaped the reward of his valour and conduct at the conclusion of the peace. In the Congress which in the spring of 1856 met

in Paris to arrange the conditions of peace, Cavour, who was his own and Piedmont's representative, had an enemy to overcome which was not Russia. If in 1855 England and France had received their ally with open arms, on the other hand, Austria, which took no part in the war, had regarded that alliance with a prophetic antipathy, sharpened not solely by a recollection of the war of 1848, but by a consciousness of the absolute and irreconcilable antagonism of principles which actuated the Courts of Vienna and Turin. As one of her nobles described it, that alliance was 'a pistol-shot fired in the ear of Austria.' And in 1856 the Austrian statesmen sought to deprive it of its effect by denying the Piedmontese plenipotentiary a place in the Congress, on the ground that Piedmont was but a kingdom of the second class, and one which, as such, could have no pretension to an equal voice in the settlement of affairs with England, France, Russia, and their own Empire. They only provoked a defeat, and an expression of sentiments from the French Emperor which, however disguised, was an ominous menace. Austria's hold over Italy had been greatly increased since the campaign of Novara; in at least an equal degree had the impatience with which the yoke was borne been augmented; and, when, at one of the later meetings of the plenipotentiaries, Louis Napoleon let fall the apparently careless question, 'What can be done for Italy?' no one could regard his words as anything but an indication of his own conviction that in some way or other the grasp in which Austria held some of the minor states of the Peninsula, Bologna, Modena, Parma, and even Tuscany, must be loosened. To the Piedmontese it was a question suggestive of something more than hope, almost of promise, though of one that could only be realised by waiting for a favourable moment, and even by aid from the Power most interested in baffling it, from Austria herself. But such a handle as was required the Court of Vienna was not unlikely to furnish. Never liberal in its dealings with the Italians, whom it regarded as foreign subjects to be kept down, it was at this time rendered more unreasonable than usual by fear; and was daily alienating the Milanese more and more by measures which the Governor called exhibitions of vigilance, but which the governed denounced as causeless tyranny. An explosion could hardly be far distant; but Piedmont must not seem to have brought it about, and Cavour was willing to wait. Among the statesmanlike qualities with which Nature had endowed him, patience had not been omitted. Mazarin himself was not more impressed with the assistance to be derived

from 'time.' And he had a large sufficiency of important subjects to occupy his attention. At home he had much to organise and place on a satisfactory footing. Abroad he had to keep up, and in some instances to establish, diplomatic relations with the statesmen of foreign countries: to disarm suspicion or enmity; to create confidence and friendliness.

In domestic policy, one of the most important and most delicate of the questions which pressed for solution concerned the different religious or quasi-religious bodies. With respect to the monastic orders, he drew a distinction between the mendicant and the charitable orders, suppressing the first altogether, but stoutly defending the second against those extreme advocates of change, who regarded extent of destruction as the test of completeness of reform. 'He would,' he said, 'quit the Ministry ten times over rather than subscribe to a law which should extinguish those orders whose employment was the instruction of the ignorant, the tending of the sick. It would be a deed deservedly prejudicial to his country in the eyes of all civilised Europe.' With respect to the secular clergy, the plan which he favoured was that of creating a special fund to be dedicated entirely to their support. To strip the Church of all endowments, so as to transform the working clergy into a body receiving salary from the State, he pronounced a measure which would create the worst form of despotism, an administrative despotism; and he urged against it a second objection of still greater weight, drawing a powerful argument from what he had seen in this country. He urged that 'it would lead to the extension and intensifying of the spirit of caste, by the complete isolation of the clergy in the midst of a civil centre;' and he pointed to the example of France, where, though 'the clergy were more moral and more zealous than their predecessors of the last century, they were undoubtedly less national and less liberal. They were infinitely more Ultramontane than their brethren in Piedmont.' And to those who recommended a third course, that of leaving the followers of the faith to remunerate their own clergy, he replied 'that such a course would create a double amount of fanaticism and Ultramontanism,' bidding the advocates of such a system look at Ireland, where it existed (he was speaking at this time, of course, only of the Roman Catholic clergy), 'where the clergy was unsalaried, drawing its means of subsistence solely from charity and the voluntary contributions of the faithful, and where, in consequence, the clergy was more fanatical and less liberal than that of France.'

Others of his measures were preparations more or less direct for war : for the aggrandisement which he hoped to win for his nation he never flattered himself could be achieved by the arts of peace alone. And indeed Austria gave a sufficiently clear indication that she contemplated the employment of force, when, at the beginning of 1857, she recalled her envoy from Turin. It was, therefore, a scarcely disguised preparation for war when he fortified Alessandria, and strengthened some of the other towns nearest the Austrian frontier : the creation of a great harbour and arsenal at La Spezzia was equally, though not so entirely, a warlike undertaking ; as also the making of a railway under Mont Cenis had the double object of facilitating intercourse between Piedmont and the countries beyond the Alps, and of providing a road by which, in case of need, a French army could come rapidly and without hindrance to her aid. He even rejoiced at the criticism to which these different undertakings were subjected, and at the opposition which they encountered in the Chambers of the Parliament, as trials which not only enabled him to set his own views more clearly before the world, but which also contributed greatly to make the whole nation sensible of the advantages of a Constitution and Constitutional Government. The character in which he desired most to be regarded was that of a Constitutional Minister. 'He preferred being under the necessity of persuading to having the power of commanding,' and pronounced 'the most inferior chamber of representatives preferable to the most brilliant imperial ante-room.' And his most politic moderation and patience was rewarded by the daily increasing confidence of all classes of his countrymen. The Chambers numbered among their members many of conspicuous ability—his old chief d'Azeglio, Alfieri, Menabrea, Ratazzi, and others ; but they all gradually recognised his pre-eminence.

'As the complication of events increased, and combinations of internal policy were added to diplomatic action, his influence increased also. The Chambers shrank from refusing him anything he asked for ; if some eccentric members of the Radical or the Absolutist parties assailed him with their conflicting attacks, they but gave him fresh opportunities of strengthening his ascendancy. Call it a dictatorship which he exercised ; it was a most exceptional one, daily granted, and continually exercised under the control of the Chambers.'

Nor was he less successful in his dealings with foreign countries. The veteran Metternich, still devoting those energies which fifty years of labour had scarcely impaired to the service of his Imperial master, pronounced him 'the

only diplomatist left in Europe.' In one quarter, indeed, the ground was prepared for him by the personal inclinations of the French Emperor, who still cherished in some degree the traditional policy which made France regard the House of Austria as her natural enemy; the recollection of his uncle's triumphs in the Lombard plains being, perhaps, also not without its effect in disposing him to seek to emulate them on the same ground; while a third motive, as yet unsuspected by Cavour himself, impelled him in the same direction. Of the other Great Powers, by his adhesion to the proposals of the Czar respecting the future organisation of the Principalities, and the union of Moldavia and Wallachia, he completely won over the Russian Cabinet; so that Prince Gortschakoff himself confessed that Russia had hitherto been mistaken in her past conduct towards the Court of Turin, and that for the future the wisest policy for the two countries would be to regard each other as 'natural allies.' In a personal interview with the Prince Regent of Prussia, now the Emperor William, he succeeded in impressing that Prince with a conviction of the moderation of his views, and their entire compatibility with the general interests. And, though in England, where Lord Palmerston was now Prime Minister, the identity of that statesman's views with those of Prince Metternich on the affairs of Eastern Europe indisposed him to run the risk of a breach with Austria if it could possibly be avoided, yet even he did not withhold expressions of warm sympathy with the constitutional government flourishing at Turin, and of willingness to join in urging the adoption of large measures of internal reform in the other Italian states, and even to give Piedmont active support if it should be attacked. In the coming contest with Austria, which it seemed plain could not be long averted, Cavour was able, by the end of 1857, to assure his sovereign that the countries which did not aid him would at least be neutral; and that, from one at least, the most vigorous assistance might certainly be looked for.

Sooner than he had probably expected the crisis came, and from what M. de Mazade calls 'one of those happy strokes of fortune which befall none but able men.' Nothing could beforehand have seemed less likely than that any project of Cavour's should be furthered by any act of the secret societies, which had long existed in different parts of Italy, but which he held in just and unconcealed abhorrence. Plots of assassination struck him with horror. Mazzini and his fellow-plotters he regarded as fanatics, whose schemes, if carried out, could not fail to be as mischievous to the cause which

they professed to espouse as they were wicked. Yet by a strange caprice of fortune, it was an abortive attempt at murder made by a member of these societies which gave the immediate impulse to the movement which was to unite Italy. In January 1858, an attempt was made to assassinate Louis Napoleon and his Empress. Cavour's first exclamation on hearing of it was a prayer that the assassins had not been Italians; but they proved to be such. And the first feelings of those who dreaded his influence was that the crime, if skilfully used, might be employed to overthrow it. The Papal Nuncio urged upon the Emperor, who was naturally incensed at the danger to which he had been exposed, that the deed was 'the natural fruit of the revolutionary passions fostered by the Sardinian Minister; while the Austrian ambassador at Paris suggested that such an atrocity was a proof 'that the time had come to establish between France and Austria a mutual understanding, in order to constrain Piedmont to leave off protecting the machinations of political refugees and the license of the revolutionary press.' And for a moment these insinuations seemed to make some impression on the uneasy mind of the intended victim of this murderous enterprise. His Foreign Minister, Count Walewski, was far less inclined than himself to further the aggrandisement of Victor Emmanuel. And, at his instigation, the French ambassador at Turin was instructed to demand of the Sardinian Government the immediate enactment of a variety of laws affecting more or less the general liberty of the press, and the practice (not unlike that of our own country) of sheltering political refugees. Cavour was in a most embarrassing dilemma. He was most earnestly anxious not to alienate the French Government, whose alliance, in the case of a rupture with Austria, would be indispensable. At the same time, he could not help confessing to himself that the uneasiness of the French Emperor, so lately the object of the vilest conspiracies, was reasonable. But he also felt that some of the measures required of him 'were inroads on' that liberal constitution of which he was so proud, '*coups d'état*,' in fact, to which he was resolved that no consideration should induce him to lend himself. From this difficulty his honesty of purpose, and the frankness, which he pleasantly was wont to describe as a new and most efficient instrument of diplomacy, extricated him. He consented to frame some new regulations calculated to increase the responsibility of editors of newspapers, and to provide additional security against the appearance of articles

tending to disturb the general tranquillity or to invite to crime. But he firmly refused to suppress even the most free-spoken journal, to expel refugees convicted of no crime against the laws of Piedmont, or, in short, to lend himself to any measures 'which might bear too visibly the stamp of foreign interference.' And, while he himself abstained from diplomatic controversy on the subject, as what was more likely to exasperate than to soothe, he recommended Victor Emmanuel himself to address Louis Napoleon in a letter at once confidential and conciliatory; expressing his personal regard for the French Emperor, and his desire to please him, but explaining also that he could make no concessions incompatible with the honour and independence of his country.

And this straightforward policy had its reward. Though greatly irritated at first, and provoked into the use of dictatorial, and even menacing language, Louis Napoleon after a time took a different view of what had occurred, and of what might be apprehended in future; and, instead of inferring that the remedy was to be found in joining with Austria to put pressure upon Piedmont, he began to trace the real source of danger to the policy of Austria herself. 'As long as there were Austrians in Italy, there would be attempts at assassination in Paris. The best safeguard against the renewal of such attempts would be found in supporting Cavour.' And the idea, so propitious for Piedmont, gradually acquired such dominion over his mind, that in the course of the summer he invited the Count to a secret interview at Plombières, where he himself was taking the waters. Aware that his Ministers did not all share his views, he admitted none of them into his confidence; but, on pretext of showing his visitor some striking scenes in the neighbourhood, he took him out for an excursion in a phaeton, driven by himself, and thus in a conversation of three or four hours' duration the conditions of an alliance were settled. Its principal objects were a war to be waged by the two countries as allies against Austria; a large addition to the dominion of Victor Emmanuel; and (though this was not suspected at first) the eventual cession of Savoy and Nice to France.

It was not without a pang that Cavour submitted to this last-mentioned condition. Savoy was the cradle of the royal family. But Louis Napoleon made no pretensions to disinterested virtue, and was not inclined to aggrandise Piedmont without obtaining some corresponding advantage for his own empire. He argued that the increase of strength which the kingdom on the southern side of the Alps was to acquire,

made an addition to the strength of her own frontier on the northern side of the great mountains a necessity for France. The reasoning might have been disputed; but what was beyond dispute, was that Savoy and Nice were the price by which alone that alliance could be purchased which Cavour desired. And, as he regarded the advantages to be derived from French co-operation as far outweighing the sacrifice, he resolutely made it, and though he had no doubt it would be fiercely condemned by some, he trusted to his own influence with the Chambers to engage them to ratify the agreement.

When the time came he found his anticipations on this point fully realised. And his foresight was equally accurate when he reckoned on Austria herself so far aiding his plans as to furnish France with a reasonable plea for coming to his assistance. In one point of view, Victor Emmanuel and his ally may be said to have given the signal for war by their language at the beginning of the year. On New Year's day, Louis Napoleon publicly addressed the Austrian Ambassador in language which asserted, as a well-known fact, the existence of a coolness between the two Emperors; an assertion which, though professedly regretful, the Court of Vienna could hardly avoid regarding as a menace. And in the following week, at the opening of the Sardinian Chambers, Victor Emmanuel spoke of 'the cry of anguish which reached him from so many parts of Italy,' as 'darkening the horizon and creating dangers;' expressions in which the threat can hardly be said to have been disguised. Sovereigns who spoke thus were clearly not averse to war; still its outbreak might perhaps have been postponed had not Austria of her own accord precipitated it. She fell into the error, which has since been repeated by other States on a larger scale, of believing herself better prepared for instant operations than her enemies. In fact, ever since she had recalled her envoy from Turin, she had been preparing for war. She had even withdrawn the ablest of her princes, the gallant but unfortunate Archduke Maximilian, from his vice-royalty of Lombardy, because he seemed too liberal and conciliatory. And she now began to strengthen her army in Lombardy with continual reinforcements, while in every regiment the talk was of nothing but the approaching war, and the 'capture of Turin, which was to be the first stage of the march upon Paris.' By March, when Russia, desirous to serve the Cabinet of Vienna, had proposed that a Congress should meet to deliberate on the affairs of Italy, she had felt herself strong enough to propose that Sardinia should have no admittance to such an

assembly; and at the end of April she felt that she could venture to send a peremptory demand to Turin that Sardinia should disarm, with the alternative of war, if it were not acceded to within three days.

But neither had Cavour been idle. He too had been arming, and he had been negotiating. He sent his old chief, d'Azeglio, as ambassador to England, where the Ministers of the day, though, from old friendship for Austria, unwilling to see her despoiled of any part of her dominions, so far showed an agreement with his views that they earnestly pressed upon her the abrogation of some existing treaties, and the adoption of a more liberal policy with regard to Italy; and he went himself to Paris, where he had more than one conference with the Emperor, whom he found, as usual, vacillating and inconsistent, but whom he ultimately brought to a decision the tenour of which was soon displayed by its fruits, which were reaped with a rapidity then unprecedented.

At the end of the three days allowed by Austria for the consideration of her demand, her envoy was dismissed with courtesy, but with an absolute rejection of it. And the bold Minister who sent him back showed his confidence in the coming struggle in a way not uncharacteristic of one to whom social enjoyment was never without its charm. '*Alea jacta est*,' said he to his colleagues, 'we have made some history, and we will go to dinner.' It was the evening of the 26th of April. His intended refusal of the Austrian ultimatum had already been communicated to Paris. And on the morning of the 29th, one French division marched through the passes of the Alps, entered Piedmont, and on the 30th reached Turin itself, where its presence was hailed as a sure presage and means of victory.

Matters had turned out entirely in accordance with Cavour's wishes. There was war; but it was not Sardinia, but Austria, which was the challenger. Sardinia was not the attacker, but she was attacked, but she was prepared for the shock. The talents of La Marmora were not confined to the field of battle. He had organised the army, and had brought every branch of the service into a high state of efficiency, so that it was now in a condition to take a creditable part in any military operations. And when Cavour, in the fulness of his exultation, adjourned the Chambers till the conclusion of the campaign, he dared to predict that their next meeting would be not as a Piedmontese, but as an Italian, Parliament.

We cannot linger over the details of the campaign which ensued, and which was singularly brief and brilliant. On

May 13, Louis Napoleon himself arrived to take the nominal command of his army. On the 20th the hostile armies met in their first action at Montebello, and the next five weeks saw five more conflicts, every one of which ended in favour of the allies. Palestro, though but a combat on a limited scale, was perhaps the one most grateful to the Piedmontese pride, since there their own king, Victor Emmanuel, commanded in person. Magenta that enabled the allied Sovereigns to enter Milan in triumph. Solferino compelled the Austrians to renounce all idea of arresting the progress of their foes in the open field, and once more to trust for safety to the impregnable strength of their Quadrilateral.

Cavour's projects, as was natural, had grown with the rapidity and completeness of success; and he was revolving plans for profiting to the utmost by the recent events, when, in the second week of July, intelligence reached him and his royal master that Napoleon had invited the Austrian Emperor to a conference at Villafranca, and had concluded with him a treaty of peace. In all probability, Napoleon's reasons were really those which he alleged. The late battles had cost him many thousand men, and he saw reason to apprehend that, if the war were protracted, the other states of Germany might come to the support of Austria, and that thus the war might spread over all Europe. Still, however cogent such arguments may have been, it was a strange exercise of his superior power thus to retire from the war without the slightest notice of his intentions to his ally. Nor, though the treaty gave all Lombardy, with the exception of Mantua and Peschiera, to Sardinia as the prize of war, could Victor Emmanuel be insensible to the slight put upon him, or forbear to show his feelings in the very act of adding his signature.

He had, however, no alternative but to agree with a good grace to what he could not undo. It was manifest that his kingdom could not continue the contest single-handed; manifest also that he had gained a great deal. A single stroke of the pen had doubled his dominions; and Cavour could not be less sensible than he of the weight of these considerations. But at the same time he felt that his position as a Constitutional Minister and the ostensible adviser of his King, made his position and duty different from that of his master. If he signed the peace he made himself responsible, not only for its conditions, but for the very act of concluding it; and to this he was too deeply mortified to consent. He feared that 'all that he had done for the union of the Italians might be compromised;' and, rather than appear to a single

one of his countrymen a party to a retrograde movement, he resigned his office.

His retirement is almost the only act in which M. de Mazade is inclined to question his judgment. But even he cannot deny that it showed a perfect agreement with the feelings of all his countrymen. Their disappointment and indignation at the treaty of Villafranca was universal throughout Italy. And their confidence in his patriotism and integrity, little as it needed increase, was augmented when they found how fully he shared the general feeling.

Cavour was a man far above all trickery ; and we have no doubt that, when he resigned office, he did so in good faith, without a thought of returning to it. But to lookers-on, especially in foreign countries, it was clear from the first that his withdrawal from public life could not be permanent or even long. In fact, Villafranca was but a truce, not a peace. Even in concluding it Louis Napoleon had let fall the significant words, 'Now we shall see what the Italians can do unaided.' And very few weeks elapsed before they began to show both their power and their resolution to take their affairs into their own hands. In every State north of the Tiber popular assemblies overthrew the existing governments, and made new arrangements which were avowedly only intended to be temporary, and to prepare the way for annexation to Piedmont. The enthusiastic leader Farini even formed a new state, Emilia, out of the old Duchy of Bologna and the Legations which had hitherto formed the most important portion of the papal territory. The Grand Duke of Tuscany, because he was a prince of Austrian blood, was driven from Florence ; and the great Florentine noble, Ricasoli, justly extolled by M. de Mazade as, 'next to Cavour, the chief author of the Italian transformation,' rejecting with noble disdain all personal temptations, declared openly for adding that splendid province to the new dominion of Victor Emmanuel.

To provide for the reception of such a vast addition of territory and subjects was by itself a task requiring the highest exertions and attributes of statesmanship. To organise a government for the territories already acquired ; to fuse the old rivals, Lombardy and Piedmont, in harmonious union into one compact and cordial whole, was one which required in a still greater degree administrative capacity of the highest quality, united with consummate address and that art of inspiring confidence which, though among the rarest, is, at the same time, one of the most indispensable endow-

ments for a true ruler of men. But Cavour's successor, La Marmora, was a soldier, not a statesman; and, though deservedly beloved by the Sardinian army, proud of the laurels which under him it had won in the Crimea, was but little known to the peaceful citizens of Turin, and not at all to the Milanese or the Florentines. Autumn had hardly begun before the general voice began to demand the return to power of the only man who could unite in harmonious action the present and the past, and pave the way for a more glorious, though at the same time a more difficult future. And thus in January 1860, Cavour once more became Prime Minister of what was still entitled the kingdom of Sardinia.

The work for which it may be said that he was thus recalled to power now proceeded rapidly. The arrangements consequent on the overthrow of the old authority in Tuscany and the smaller states were avowedly temporary; and the ultimate decision on their future government was left to the people themselves. Their votes were taken, at what it had lately become the fashion to call a *plébiscite*, in March, and an overwhelming majority in every province resolved to solicit Victor Emmanuel to receive them as his subjects.

But there was another vote also to be taken. Napoleon's demand of Savoy and Nice had been tacitly abandoned at Villafranca: but the further addition to the kingdom of Sardinia led to its revival; and Cavour, having once consented to the cession, felt it impossible to deny that recent events had strengthened France's plea for requiring it; and that, if it had been worth while to make it, when it was the price of but a single province, it was an infinitely better bargain when all Italy north of the Tiber was to be purchased by it. The moment, therefore, that the claim was renewed, he granted it; and he had but little difficulty in inducing the Piedmontese Chambers to adopt his view and ratify the sacrifice. And, if any justification of his policy were needed, it might be found in the fact that the transfer of their allegiance to France was not unwillingly submitted to by the Savoyards and citizens of Nice themselves. For their wishes also were consulted by a *plébiscite*, and there the majority in favour of annexation to France was still more overwhelming than that by which the Tuscans and Emilians had decided to range themselves under the Sardinian banner.

But, extensive and important as were these additions to his Sovereign's territories, Fortune had yet a gift in store for Cavour of still greater magnitude and value. It may well be called a gift, since he in no way contributed to it, save by the

most passive acquiescence. The government of the King of Naples had long been a by-word for tyranny and cruelty. It had more than once driven the people to the very point of revolt. And now, the example of the Northern States kindled the slumbering fires of discontent from the Garigliano to Cape Passaro; at the different cities in Sicily insurrections were organised, the spirit of which rapidly spread to the mainland; and islanders and citizens of the continental towns alike took up arms to relieve themselves of the Bourbon yoke, and to unite their fortunes to those of their brethren of the North. They were not long in finding an ally and leader from the North. Twelve years before, Garibaldi had sought to head a similar movement, but his enterprise had been premature. It was with difficulty that he himself escaped to Caprera, where he had since been living inactive and impatient. At the beginning of the previous year, he had desired to take part in the war which was approaching; but Cavour had feared that a coadjutor so notorious for republican principles would alarm more than his reputation for ability as a leader of irregular troops would attract; and he returned to his island, to wait for a more favourable opportunity, or for allies with fewer scruples.

He found it now in the Sicilian insurrection. At the first intelligence of the outbreak he began to raise a volunteer force for the support of the insurgents; and in the first week of May he landed at Marsala, where he was received with open arms by men sadly in want of a leader, and at once began operations against the Royal troops. Cavour was so entirely free from all connivance at his enterprise, that Garibaldi's last act before he set sail was to write a letter to Victor Emmanuel couched in a tone of resentful sarcasm against the Minister for his cession of Nice, the city in which Garibaldi had been born. Absurd as it may seem, he actually hoped, if he should succeed in his undertaking, to induce the King to dismiss his great Minister, and to accept him as his successor; for he had renounced his republicanism, and from the first avowed his object to be to add the kingdom of the Two Sicilies to that of Sardinia. As Cavour was wholly unconnected with his undertaking, we may dispense with dwelling upon it. Suffice it to say that a campaign of a few weeks sufficed to clear Sicily of the Neapolitan troops; that before the end of the summer the brave Condottiere found himself strong enough to cross over to the mainland, and march northwards upon Naples. He was joined everywhere by the citizens of the towns and peasantry of the districts through which he passed.

Francis II. fled at his approach. On September 8, Garibaldi entered his beautiful capital as its master, and, before the end of the next month, the Sardinian Government, professing to regard the Pope's employment of French troops as a justification to all Italians for making war upon him, sent an army into the Papal territories which virtually terminated the contest by inflicting a decisive defeat on the French General Lamoricière. A few days afterwards Victor Emmanuel entered Naples in triumph, where Garibaldi hailed him as 'King of Italy,' and the monarch in brief emphatic terms acknowledged the services of the brave soldier, who, in thus saluting him, acknowledged himself to be his subject.

Italy was now almost one united kingdom. The city of Rome and Venetia were the only districts remaining in which the sovereign authority of Victor Emmanuel was not recognised. And Garibaldi, flushed with success, was eager to make a dash on the cities of both Pope and Doge, and thus to terminate the contest in a single campaign. He was so little either of a general or of a statesman, that he was quite unable to estimate or even to see the obstacles to such enterprise; and it is not the least triumph of Cavour's sagacity and address that he was able to curb and control his hot-headed enthusiasm without wholly breaking with him, or giving him any ground to complain that the services which he had really rendered to the Italian cause were overlooked or repaid with ingratitude. Cavour, however, had not only a more comprehensive foresight, but, what was still more important, a far higher sense of responsibility. Though he did not conceal his conviction that 'no city but Rome could be the capital of Italy,' he was yet aware that any precipitation on his part might compel France to place herself across his path, and bind Napoleon to the part of champion of the Pope, which he was secretly not unwilling to lay aside. Nor was the French Emperor the only potentate whose susceptibilities he felt it necessary to avoid unduly wounding. Cialdini had not led his army against Ancona without provoking warm remonstrances even from Prussia and Russia, though neither the King nor the Czar acknowledged allegiance to the Pope. And, if these princes felt bound to show an interest in the position of Pius IX., much more had Cavour to fear bringing on the new kingdom the hostility of those potentates who recognised him as their spiritual sovereign. It was, in his view, indispensable that 'the great body of the Roman Catholics in Italy and elsewhere should not see in the reunion of Rome with Italy the source of the subjection of the

Church. In other words, we go to Rome,' said he 'but not to restrict the independence of the Sovereign Pontiff, nor to bring spiritual things under the yoke of civil authority.'

The impolicy of a present attack on Venetia was perhaps even more evident. It could not fail to cause an instant rupture with Austria, in which the new kingdom would not have the sympathy of a single state in Europe. Such a sympathy he did not indeed despair of at some future time. 'But the Italians must first show to Europe a well-organised and solid State, based on the will of the people; then,' he said, 'the opinion of Europe might change. The fate of Venice would excite interest not only in generous France and in just England, but even in noble-minded Germany.' And for this change of circumstances he was contented to wait patiently, having indeed abundance of employment in bringing the new kingdom into the condition which he had thus pointed out.

It may seem somewhat strange to those who remember the inflexible tenacity with which the Government of the Vatican has at all times clung to every prerogative it has ever established, and even to every claim which it has ever advanced, that Cavour anticipated less difficulty in dealing with the Pope than with the Emperor. His own description of his object, the establishment of a free church in a free state, seems to Protestants to contain in those few words two principles that the Papacy would never acknowledge. But Cavour was so convinced that the deprivation of temporal sovereignty would be a gain rather than a loss to the Pope, that he did not despair of persuading him to regard the matter in the same light as himself. And he did succeed in inducing Pius to receive an envoy from the King, and to enter with him into the discussion of his plans; though it is hardly likely that the Sovereign Pontiff ever seriously entertained the idea of renouncing a particle of his temporal any more than of his spiritual sovereignty. Cavour could hardly have been surprised at the failure of his first negotiation, and he was not spared to lay the foundation of a second.

In a career such as his every new success, instead of being a relief, commonly brings with it additional toil and anxiety, and throughout the spring of 1861 it became evident to all his friends that his health was giving way under the constant strain to which both body and mind were subjected; and they looked forward for the holiday which the adjournment of the Parliament would afford him to recruit his strength. But the vacation which they were hoping for for him he might not see. On May 29, he had been offering a vigorous

resistance to some proposals of the Republican party in the Parliament; but on returning to his house he complained of unusual weakness. He gave himself rest but for a single day. On the 31st he returned to his office, but it was his last effort. On the morning of June 1 all Turin knew that he was seriously ill; by the evening they learnt that he was dying. During the few following days he was often delirious; but whenever he came to himself, his thoughts and broken words were given to the country he had served so diligently. At times he spoke with exultation of what he had done, 'there are no longer Lombards, Piedmontese, Tuscans, or Romans, all are Italians.' At times he dwelt with anxiety on what remained to be done; and, as if sanguine of recovery, expressed his resolution to avoid equally the license of Republicanism and the fierce coercion of absolute governments. 'He would govern with liberty, and would show the world what ten years of liberty could do for the country.' On the morning of the 6th, Fra Giacomo, a priest whom he had always highly esteemed, administered to him the rites of the Church. And, when his prayers were ended, Cavour, pressing his hand, returned in thought to his projects for the Church's future. 'Frate, frate,' said he, 'libera chièsa in libero stato.' They were his last words; almost while uttering them he laid his head back on the pillow and died without a struggle. He was not yet 51 years of age.

In what may be called the foreign policy of the new kingdom thus prematurely deprived of his guidance, the greater part of what remained to be done was accomplished within ten years of his death, though not exactly as he had expected. It was not to any increase of friendliness in Germany, but to war among the Germans themselves, that Victor Emmanuel owed the acquisition of Venetia. It was to the misfortunes of the very ally on whose co-operation Cavour had most steadily reckoned that he was indebted for his establishment in Rome. But it was in no slight degree because the great Minister's policy, both at home and abroad, was still wisely adhered to, that the desire for annexation to the new kingdom continued to influence every part of the peninsula. And a still more undeniable testimony to his merits, as being dictated by a judgment in which patriotic excitement could have no part, is to be found in the sorrow expressed for his loss in foreign countries, and especially in our own Parliament. He had had dealings with the leaders of both parties. Both, when in office, had somewhat disappointed his hopes by the caution which their duty to their own

country imposed upon them, and which bound them to abstain from active interposition in a quarrel with which British interests had no connection. But from both sides of both Houses there now came a general lamentation for his death as a public calamity. Lord Palmerston spoke of him as the one great originator of all the improvements, social, moral, and political, which had taken place in Italy, improvements which would long survive him, and would entail inestimable benefits on the country. And Lord Malmesbury, though in his negotiations with Cavour when alive he had seemed to his eager enthusiasm less warm in the cause of Italian liberty than his Whig rival, was now still more emphatic than he in his expression of the feelings that, as what the Italians had done was owing to his influence, so their success in what they had still to do would depend on the degree in which they remembered the lessons of combined prudence and resolution which he had inculcated. 'His memory would be a beacon and example to them, which it was most important that they should follow, not only for their own sake, but for that of every country in Europe.'

ART. IV.—ENGLISH CHURCHMEN ON THE CONTINENT.

1. *Life of White Kennett, Bishop of Peterborough.* 1730.
2. *An Account of the Levant Company.* 1825.
3. *An Enquiry into the State of the Church of England Congregations in France, &c.* By Rev. R. BURGESS. 1850.
4. *Reports of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.* 1875-6.
5. *Reports of the Colonial and Continental Church Society.* 1875-6.

FOR many years the position of the Church of England abroad has from time to time occupied the attention of Churchmen. Convocation, the Church Congress, Church periodicals, have all in turn taken the matter up; but while the importance of the subject has always been insisted upon, the difficulty of dealing with it has generally left the matter, to all appearance, very much where it was. At the same time it is encouraging

to remark that at the various intervals at which the subject has come to the surface, though many complaints have still been made, it has generally been admitted, at each succeeding epoch, that matters have improved, though always with the additional observation that much remains to be done. We here propose to give a brief historical sketch of Church of England ministrations abroad, and then to consider her present position, the work which is being done, what is still needed, and the best methods of effecting it.

The earliest foreign chaplaincies of which we have any distinct account appear to have been those established in connection with English ambassadors, among whom we find the mention of Mr. Chamberlayne, ambassador from King Edward VI. to the Lady Regent of Flanders in 1550, and Mr. Mann, ambassador of Queen Elizabeth in Spain in 1556, both of whom were attended by their chaplains, and both of whom were interrupted in the exercise of their religion by being prohibited from having service in their own houses—a prohibition which was removed upon the urgent representations of the English Government. Sir Jerome Bowes, ambassador to the Russian Court from Queen Elizabeth, is described as 'being attended upon with forty persons at the least, very honourably furnished, whereof many were gentlemen, and one Mr. Humfrey Cole, a learned preacher.'¹

With the gradual development of English commerce, factories, or establishments of English merchants and factors, who negotiated business for themselves and their employers, were established in many parts of the Continent; and wherever Englishmen resided abroad, they were, in those days, accompanied by the ordinances of the English Church. All such congregations are said to have been placed under the Bishop of London 'as their diocesan,' by Order of the King in Council in the reign of Charles I., during Laud's episcopate; and such jurisdiction is referred to in a letter from Laud when Archbishop of Canterbury, dated June 17, 1634, in consequence of an Order in Council for bringing the English factories and forces in Holland to a conformity with the Liturgy.

This letter commends to the English factory at Delph Mr. Beaumont, chosen by joint consent of their company to be their preacher, and informing them of the King's express command that they, and 'all and every other merchant that is or shall be residing in those parts beyond the seas, do conform themselves to the doctrine and discipline settled in

¹ Hakluyt, i. 516.

the Church of England, and that they frequent the common prayers with all religious duty and reverence at all times required, as well as they do sermons.' And Mr. Beaumont was enjoined to keep and observe all the orders of the Church of England, as they are prescribed in the canons and rubrics of the Liturgy; and if any should be refractory, his name and offence were to be certified to the Bishop of London, who was 'to take order and give remedy accordingly.'¹

Among the most important settlements of English merchants were the factories of the Levant Company, a society incorporated by royal charter in 1581, and which only ceased to exist in 1825. Two years after its foundation letters were addressed by Queen Elizabeth to the Kings of Cambay and China, and sent by the hands of English merchants, two of whom published an account of their proceedings. Their course was by Tripoli in Syria, and by Aleppo to Babylon, thence to the island of Ormus, after which they proceeded to Goa and as far as Agra, Patna, Pegu, Malacca, Ceylon, and the coast of Malabar.² The information thus acquired gave a fresh impetus to the exertions and influence of the Levant Company, and not the least honourable of many excellent deeds of this society was the care which was taken to secure for all in their employment the enjoyment of Church privileges.

The list of their chaplains includes many of the most able and devoted clergy of the time in which they lived. Among them was Edward Pocock, chaplain at Aleppo from 1630 to 1636, when he became the first Laudian professor of Arabic at Oxford—a man distinguished not only for his learning, but for the zealous discharge of his pastoral duties. 'What he laboured to persuade others to he duly practised himself, proposing to his hearers in his own regular and unspotted life a bright example of the holiness he recommended.' In 1637 he visited Constantinople, where he officiated as chaplain to the British ambassador. He was made professor of Hebrew at Oxford in 1648, but was turned out of the canonry attached to it in 1650, and an attempt was made to eject him from his parish of Childrey, which was successfully resisted by Owen, Dean of Christ Church, who declared that he could not be a party to 'turning out a man for insufficiency whom all the learned, not of England, but of all Europe, so justly admired for his vast knowledge and extraordinary accomplishments.' He lived to the advanced age of eighty-seven, having, in the course of his long life, suffered many persecutions from the turbulent

¹ Collier, viii. 90.² Hakluyt, ii. 382-398.

spirit of the times, which he bore with singular tranquillity, charity, and forgetfulness of injuries. As a pastor he was highly respected by all classes abroad not only for his great learning, but for his zeal and assiduity in performing his duties, which no hazard from plague or any other cause ever deterred him from.¹ Another of the chaplains at Aleppo was Robert Huntingdon, Fellow of Merton College, Oxford, afterwards Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, and finally Bishop of Raphoe, in Ireland; Robert Frampton, Bishop of Gloucester, a non-juror, the contemporary and intimate friend of the saintly Ken, and a man of the same mind and spirit, was also chaplain at Aleppo for sixteen years.

The ministry of such men could hardly fail to bear good fruit, and we find Henry Maundrell, one of Bishop Frampton's successors at Aleppo, writing of his flock in the following terms in a letter addressed to Sprat, Bishop of Rochester:—

'They are a society highly meriting that excellent character which is given of them in England, and which (besides the general vogue) your Lordship has sometime received from a most faithful and judicious hand—the excellent Bishop Frampton. As he was undoubtedly the great improver of the rare temper of this society, so he may well be esteemed best able to give them their true and deserved character. I need only add that such they still continue as that incomparable instructor left them—that is, pious, sober, benevolent, devout in the offices of religion, in conversation innocently cheerful, given to no pleasures but such as are innocent and manly, to no communications but such as the nicest ears need not be offended at, exhibiting in all their actions those best and truest signs of a Christian spirit, a sincere and cheerful charity towards others and a profound reverence for the Liturgy of the Church of England. It is our first employment every morning to solemnise the daily service of the Church, at which I am always sure to have a devout, a regular, and a full congregation.'²

Another of the Levant Company's chaplains was Thomas Shaw, afterwards Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford, who was chaplain to the factory at Algiers.

Before the close of the seventeenth century negotiations had been successfully made for securing to the members of our Church residing in Russia the free enjoyment of her worship, and in 1703, in the earliest published Report of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, we find that the factory of English merchants then established at Moscow had received from the Czar a piece of ground upon which they were to

¹ Anderson's *History of the Colonial Church*, ii. 124; *Account of the Levant Company*, 1825, p. 38.

² *A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem*, by Henry Maundrell. Oxford 1740. Sixth edition.

build a church, and a residence for the chaplain ; and reference is made in the same Report to a grant of books for the benefit of the factory. This factory removed to S. Petersburg with their chaplain in 1723. It is also stated, in reference to Amsterdam, where an English Church service appears to have been first held in 1698, 'For the interest of the English nation, the honour of its Established Church, and comfort of its members residing here in peace and war, as gentlemen, merchants, soldiers, seamen, &c., the burgomasters have given a piece of ground for building an English church ; till that can be compass'd a private chapel is made use of, where there is a pretty good Church of England congregation.'

This Report further speaks of important work to be done, if sufficient funds can be obtained, and care to be had of 'factories and places to which we trade in Asia, Africa, and Europe itself, where they live as it were without God in the world, to the great reproach of the Christian religion, except at Hamborough, Lisbon, Smyrna, Aleppo, Constantinople, Fort S. George, Surat, &c., which are well supplied by our worthy merchants that trade or live there.'

At Lisbon and Oporto English chaplaincies have existed from the time of Charles II., though both in his reign and in that of James II. they were at times forced away by the Inquisition, because the English Court did not insist upon their protection.

In 1706 the English factory at Leghorn sought to obtain a resident English chaplain, and application was made by Dr. Henry Newton, her Majesty's Envoy at the Court of Florence, who could obtain no express license or protection from the Duke of Tuscany, but only a general intimation that the civil powers should not molest him, though they could not exempt him from the cognisance and supreme authority of the Inquisition at Rome. Some of the Leghorn merchants who were acquainted with White Kennett, afterwards Bishop of Peterborough, having discussed this project with him, induced him to lay the matter before the Archbishop of Canterbury (Tenison), who readily concurred in the opinion that 'such a privilege of the exercise of religion, by a lawful minister of it, was a right of Christians, even by the law of nations, in every country where they were allowed to settle and to traffick.' The result was that the Rev. Basil Kennett, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, brother of White Kennett, was appointed to the chaplaincy, which he held for five years. The jealousy of the Italians was, however, aroused by the appointment, although Mr. Kennett appears to have confined

his attentions exclusively to the members of his own flock, and secret orders were sent by the Inquisition to apprehend the English chaplain, and imprison and make away with him at Pisa, or some other religious prison. Mr. Kennett was urged to retire to Florence, to be under the protection of the ambassador, but he declined to leave his post, though he did not dare to leave his house excepting when guarded by two English merchants, who walked one on either side of him, armed with swords. On the matter being reported to the Earl of Sunderland, directions were given by the Queen that the Grand Duke should be informed that if the chaplain at Leghorn were molested she would consider it as an insult done to herself and the nation, and would resent it accordingly, after which Mr. Kennett was free from further annoyance.

In 1710 he wished to resign on account of ill-health, but, in consequence of the objections raised by the Duke of Tuscany to the presence of an English chaplain at Leghorn, he retained the post until the following year, when the objections having been disposed of, Mr. Taubman was appointed to succeed him, and he in turn having held the chaplaincy for five years, was succeeded by Mr. Crowe. The opposition which Mr. Kennett encountered must have been due to the hostility of the Inquisition rather than to any objection on the part of the inhabitants of Leghorn, for when Berkeley, afterwards Bishop of Cloyne, visited Leghorn in 1714, he was assured that the Roman Catholics regarded Kennett as a saint.

The appointment of Mr. Taubman by an Order in Council of October 1711 is interesting as having reference to the supposed jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, as it directs that Mr. Taubman, 'or such other chaplain as the Bishop of London shall recommend to her Majesty, be forthwith sent to Leghorn in such manner and in such circumstances as the Rev. W. Basil Kennett was sent.'¹

We cannot but remark the high standing of some of these early foreign chaplains; we find among them men noted for their learning and piety, who on returning to England were promoted to some of the highest dignities in the Church and in the universities. They appear to have exercised their office not only with the greatest fidelity, but also in such a manner as to have given no offence to the people of the country in which they were sojourning. No doubt they received remuneration more adequate to their services than the scanty and precarious stipends which are attached to most

¹ *Life of White Kennett*, Bishop of Peterborough, pp. 52-101.

foreign chaplaincies in the present day, as we find reference made to the liberality of the merchants, who seem to have provided the entire stipend of the chaplains; but we must refer the high character of the clergy ministering abroad to the interest felt in their work by the Church at home, while the subsequent decline in their position and character must be equally referred to the heavy shadow cast over the Church of England during the administration of Walpole, and to her loss of vitality and influence under the House of Hanover.¹ As the tone of Church teaching and practice deteriorated in England, as churches were closed, Communion became less frequent, catechising ceased, and the clergy became apathetic and worldly-minded, it was only natural that English congregations on the Continent should be neglected, and be left either without any ministrations whatever or to receive those of the clergy who fell below even the low standard still required at home. Unlicensed, and free from all interference, men burdened with debt, or of scandalous life, appeared as the representatives of the Church of England wherever an advantageous arrangement with a hotel-keeper, or the toleration of those to whom they ministered, allowed them an opportunity of establishing themselves. There existed, without doubt, many who were bright exceptions, and who strove both by their lives and teaching to uphold the dignity of their office, but the prevailing character of Continental chaplains became a byword and a reproach to the English Church.

The means adopted for supporting the chaplaincies were in exact accordance with the character of the incumbents. What traveller on the Continent of thirty years ago does not remember the money-taker at the door of the so-called English church, and the payment exacted, with the dirty card or ivory check given in return for it, which entitled the holder to admission and to a seat in a high pew? As a step in advance came the custom of holding a plate at the door before service, which gave the exacted payment a kind of voluntary look, while the card or counter was dispensed with. And then what dreary services—little or no music, no responses above a whisper, and a general appearance of people being very uncomfortable, and having come together to do something they were rather ashamed of, and which they would be glad to get over as soon as possible. Such are our own vivid recollections of Church of England services on the Continent in years gone by. Can we wonder that a

¹ See *Church Quarterly Review*, July 1877.

large number of English residents abroad have fallen away from the Church of their fathers—some to become members of some foreign Protestant congregation which showed more signs of life, some few to join the Church of Rome, but the greater number to become practically heathens; often holding strongly to the name of Protestant, but ignorant of the name of Churchman and too often disgracing that of Christian?

Such, it may be said, is a picture rather of years gone by than of to-day, and happily there is a great improvement to record; but not one word which we have written is too strong, or too highly coloured, a description of many of the small communities of English still existing in Europe. The evil which has been done in past years cannot be quickly repaired; and if the Church at home has not yet recovered from the depression of the Georgian era, we cannot wonder if among her children scattered abroad those who have been uncared for and unsought after are well-nigh lost from her fold.

Let us now turn our attention to the different agencies by which a measure of improvement, varying greatly in its extent, has been effected in the condition of Continental chaplaincies. We have already referred to the Levant Company, established in the reign of Elizabeth, and to the care taken by this society for the spiritual welfare of its members and those employed under them. In 1821, Turkey having become the theatre of political contest, and the greatest interests being discussed and settled by the British ambassador, it became evident that it was expedient that the whole establishment of consuls and dragomans should be in the appointment and under the control of the Government. The matter was laid before the Company by Mr. Canning (then Secretary for Foreign Affairs), who assured them that the measure proposed was entirely upon grounds of public interest, and that the Government imputed no blame or want of good administration to the Company; and upon a meeting of the directors being held, the view propounded by Mr. Canning was admitted, and the original objects for which the Company had been formed having long since been attained, it was determined to surrender their charter to Government and to dissolve the society, which had maintained an honourable and useful existence for 244 years. After paying all their officers, and providing for any who would no longer be required in the service of the Government, a considerable balance remained; and as there was no legitimate use to which the money could be put besides the payment of salaries and pensions, it was determined to hand it over to the Government, and it

was accordingly placed to the account of the Consolidated Fund.¹

In the same year (1825) in which the Levant Company ceased to exist an Act of Parliament was passed, in which provision was made for grants in aid of chaplaincies in places where British consuls were appointed. Such a measure was an act of the merest justice, as without it those places which had enjoyed Church privileges under the rule of the Levant Company would have now been left destitute of them. This Act (6 George IV., cap. 87) has undoubtedly been productive of good, although it was made subversive of all Church principles in one important point by allowing a mere money qualification for a vote at the church meetings for managing the affairs of the chaplaincies²—a precedent which has been most unhappily followed in the constitution of some other Church of England committees on the Continent. The scandals which arose in consequence of this rule in the island of Madeira are probably known to many of our readers, and we will not here reopen a dark page in the annals of the Church abroad. The earnest endeavours made in 1848 by the late Bishop of Capetown (who acted officially in this matter for the Bishop of London) to reconcile the divisions which had arisen, will be fresh in the minds of the readers of the interesting *Life of Bishop Gray*; but an extract from a letter which the Bishop wrote in reply to the complaints of a clergyman who was sent out by Lord Palmerston to supersede the chaplain who had been previously appointed by the Foreign Office, and whose license the Bishop of London, after full enquiry, declined to revoke, may be quoted here, because the principle laid down is one which is still applicable to the divisions which have, unhappily, since arisen in more than one place on the Continent:—

‘I was asked what would be the duty of the members of the Church of England in the island of Madeira, should Lord Palmerston send out a clergyman to supersede Mr. Lowe, the Bishop of London (who exercises the spiritual oversight of our communion there with the consent of the Church) refusing to withdraw his license from Mr. Lowe or to give it to Lord Palmerston’s nominee. To this question I gave the only reply which a bishop of the Church of England could give—that I considered it was the duty of every member of the Church of England in the island to communicate with him, and him only, who had the bishop’s license; that it would be an act of schism to communicate with any other. . . . If you and those who communicate with you are not in schism, I do not know what schism is.’³

¹ 6 George IV., cap. 33.

² Section 14 of the Act.

³ *Life of Robert Gray, Bishop of Capetown*, i. 150.

The good which has resulted from the Consular Act has been that, at a time when the characters of many Continental chaplains would not bear investigation, there was some guarantee at least as to the respectability of any clergyman appointed under this Act. And although, as a kind of escape from the discreditable position in which he had placed himself in the Madeira case, Lord Palmerston chose for a time to dispense with the Bishop of London's license, and consequently with the usual reference to the Bishop as to the sufficiency of the testimonials presented by any candidate for a consular chaplaincy, the custom which had before invariably prevailed was afterwards again renewed, and is still continued. It is, however, greatly to the discredit of the present and the former Government that the number of consular chaplaincies has been greatly reduced. When it is remembered that the Government actually received a considerable balance from the Levant Company on the surrender of their charter, and that in the Consular Act it is declared that 'it is expedient to afford encouragement for the support of the churches and chapels, and promote the erection of other churches and chapels, in foreign ports and places to which his Majesty's subjects may resort,'¹ it is impossible in any way to justify the wholesale disestablishment of which the Foreign Office has been guilty. From forty-nine embassy and consular chaplaincies existing in 1860 the number was reduced to fourteen in 1875, and, after the most strenuous appeals from some of the deprived congregations, there are only seventeen chaplaincies on the Foreign Office list at the present time, one of which is filled by a Presbyterian minister.

In the same year in which this Consular Act was passed, an attempt was made to secure some ecclesiastical control for a portion of the Continental chaplaincies. The necessity for episcopal ministrations had long been felt by some of the British residents of our communion in France, especially for the confirmation of their children; and seeing difficulties in obtaining a consecration from England, they applied to the bishops of the Scottish Church, who proceeded in the matter with great caution, and only consented to consecrate Dr. Luscombe to be bishop of the Scots, English, and others of their communion abroad when they had clearly ascertained that they might do so with the full concurrence of the Archbishops and of the Government of the day. At length, on Sunday, March 20, 1825, the consecration was performed by

¹ Section 10 of the Act.

the Primus, Bishop Gleig, assisted by Bishops Low and Sandford, Dr. (then Mr.) Hook (the late Dean of Chichester), who was formerly a pupil of Dr. Luscombe, preaching the sermon. Afterwards the new bishop received the congratulations both of the chief English prelates and of the Prime Minister, who expressed his satisfaction, and that of his colleagues, 'that the appointment was in so good hands;' he was also presented to the King, who saluted him as 'My Lord Bishop,' and wished him success in his mission. He built a chapel at Paris, at the expense of 8,000*l.*, in the Rue d'Aguesseau, in which he officiated both as bishop and also as chaplain to the British Embassy, to which office he was appointed in 1828. This chapel was, of course, his own property, and should have been purchased by the Government, but the necessary funds were refused by Parliament, and it ultimately passed into the hands of the Colonial and Continental Church Society. The following is an extract from the letters of collation which were delivered to Bishop Luscombe by the bishops who had consecrated him:—

'He is sent by us, representing the Scotch Episcopal Church, to the Continent of Europe, not as a diocesan bishop in the modern or limited sense of the word, but for a purpose similar to that for which Titus was left by Paul in Crete, that *he may set in order the things that are wanting* among such of the natives of Great Britain and Ireland as he shall find there professing to be members of the United Church of England and Ireland and the Episcopal Church of Scotland. But we do solemnly enjoin our Right Reverend Brother Bishop Luscombe *not to disturb the peace of any Christian Society established as a National Church* in whatever nation he may chance to sojourn.'¹

Bishop Luscombe appears to have been an earnest and devoted Churchman, but it is to be feared that his consecration did little to diminish the evils then existing in the Church of England abroad. Some few chaplains accepted his license, some declined to sever the older tie which bound them to the Bishop of London, while those who wished to avoid all interference or enquiry were more easily able to maintain their independence when they might be supposed to have a choice as to their diocesan. On the whole it was felt that the expedient had failed, and after the sudden death of Bishop Luscombe at Lausanne, on August 24, 1846, no one was appointed to succeed him in his office of 'Missionary Bishop.'

An important step had, however, been taken in the meantime, which secured efficient episcopal superintendence for Church of England chaplaincies in the South of Europe.

¹ *An Appeal to the Scottish Church.* Introduction, p. cl.
VOL. V.—NO. X. B B

In April 1840 Bishop Blomfield addressed a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, urging the necessity of a large increase of the colonial episcopate. How greatly it was needed will be seen when we remember that on Bishop Blomfield's translation to London there were but five colonial bishops; and though the dioceses of Bombay and Madras had been formed out of the diocese of Calcutta, and Newfoundland and Toronto from Nova Scotia and Quebec, there were thus but nine bishops for the whole of our colonial empire. For the whole of the clergy and people not included in these nine dioceses, the Bishop of London was theoretically responsible, and it was therefore in every way fitting that he should take the initiative in so important a work. A public meeting was consequently held, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, on April 27, 1841, at Willis's Rooms, which were 'more crowded than upon any occasion for years'; and resolutions were passed, and speeches made, in which, among other pressing claims, the necessity for a bishop in the Mediterranean was strongly insisted upon, especially by the Archbishop and by the present Cardinal Manning, then Archdeacon of Chichester.¹ The necessity had long been felt of providing episcopal superintendence for the clergy and congregations already existing in various parts of the South of Europe, previously under the nominal jurisdiction of the Bishop of London, and of taking steps to supply the wants of the large and increasing number of our countrymen dispersed in small communities throughout the same regions. And scarcely second to this necessity was the importance of promoting a better understanding with the Churches of the East. So strongly had this been felt that in 1840 the Rev. G. Tomlinson, one of the secretaries of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, was sent on a mission to the Patriarch and other prelates of the Greek Church, furnished with commendatory letters from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London. Mr. Tomlinson met with a friendly reception from the heads of the Oriental Church, and especially from the bishops and principal clergy of Greece, and the results of this mission, together with the needs of the English residents on the Mediterranean, led to the determination that one of the first of the new bishoprics should be for those parts, and at a meeting of the Archbishops and bishops held at Lambeth, on the Tuesday in Whitsun week 1841, a declaration was put

¹ *Proceedings at a Meeting for the Endowment of Additional Bishoprics, 1841.*

forth, in which, after first proposing the establishment of a bishopric in New Zealand, the following words occur:—

‘Our next object will be to make a similar provision for the congregations of our own communion established in the islands of the Mediterranean, and in the countries bordering on that sea; and it is evident that the position of Malta is such as will render it the most convenient point of communication with them, as well as with the bishops of the ancient Churches of the East, to whom our Church has been for centuries known only by name.’

‘We propose, therefore, that a see be fixed at Valetta, the residence of the English Government, and that its jurisdiction extend to all the clergy of our Church residing within the limits above specified. In this city, through the munificence of her Majesty the Queen Dowager, a church is in course of erection, which, when completed, will form a suitable cathedral.’

There were, however, civil as well as ecclesiastical reasons which led to Gibraltar being constituted the territorial diocese and cathedral town of the bishop, as there already existed a Roman Bishop of Malta, who was acknowledged by the British Government, and the Rev. G. Tomlinson was consecrated Bishop of Gibraltar on S. Bartholomew's Day 1842.

We have entered at some length into the circumstances under which the bishopric of Gibraltar was founded, because it is important to observe the deep interest which was felt in its formation, and the hopes which were entertained of its becoming the means of free communication with the Eastern Church. The selection of Mr. Tomlinson for the bishopric was natural, from the experience which he was supposed to have already acquired; but it may be doubted whether he was as well fitted to carry out as he was to plan work so varied in its character as that of the new diocese. Still it would be unjust to his memory to deny that, if all the hopes which had been raised were not fulfilled, he yet did good work during his episcopate; and those who remember the previous condition of Church matters in Malta and Gibraltar will bear testimony to the improvement which was effected. The project of building a memorial church at Constantinople originated with Bishop Tomlinson, and was first broached in a letter to the Christian Knowledge Society on May 22, 1854; nor should we fail to record the regular share in the ordinary ministerial duties of the Chaplain of Malta borne by the Bishop during his long residence in the island, at a time when the provision for the spiritual welfare of our troops at that station was most inadequate. During Dr. Tomlinson's episcopate, which lasted until his death, many changes for the

better gradually took place. The number of clergy at Malta and Gibraltar was increased, confirmations were held at regular intervals, and a diocesan fund for the assistance of poor chaplaincies was founded. In Spain, where for a length of time there was no English chaplain—owing partly to Spanish intolerance and partly to English indifference—Bishop Tomlinson appointed as his chaplain a clergyman who visited the principal towns in which English resided, and held occasional services. At Malaga, owing to the exertions of the late Mr. Mark, a consular chaplaincy was established in 1850; and ten years later a chaplain was for the first time appointed at Madrid.

The second Bishop of Gibraltar, appointed in 1863, was Dr. Trower, who had previously—from 1848 to 1859—filled the office of Bishop of Glasgow. All who were connected with the diocese of Gibraltar during his episcopate must entertain a lively recollection of Dr. Trower's invariable kindness, courtesy, and generosity, of which a standing memorial is to be found in Trinity Church, Sliema, which was erected chiefly at his expense, while its endowment is equally a memorial of the liberality of his lamented successor, the Hon. C. A. Harris. Dr. Trower made a visitation of the whole of his diocese, notices of which appeared from time to time in the *Colonial Church Chronicle*, a useful publication, the cessation of which is much to be regretted. Among the most pleasing incidents of his visitation was the warm welcome which he received from the Archbishop of Athens when he visited that city, and the friendly intercourse which he had with the heads of the Oriental Churches as opportunity occurred. Circumstances, however, prevented Bishop Trower from continuing the regular and systematic visitation of his diocese in the manner which he felt was indispensable to the due discharge of his office, and he therefore, for a second time, resigned the active duties of episcopal life, and was succeeded by the Hon. and Rev. C. A. Harris, then Archdeacon of Wilts, who was consecrated in 1868.

Bishop Harris threw himself into his work with the greatest energy, while his genial temperament and winning manner attracted and conciliated all with whom he had to deal. Indeed, his popularity in society, and a certain playfulness of manner, were rather apt to mislead those who did not know the nature and extent of his real work; but never was a bishop more accessible to, and one with, his clergy. Under his influence daily prayers and weekly Communion became rather the rule than the exception, and he was the more

readily deferred to, and his advice more frequently sought, because he was the first to recognise the exceptional nature of his work, and the difficulties besetting any attempt to take a stand upon his legal position. To quote his own words—

‘Although the bishop’s *rights* are few, my experience of the universal respect for his office on the part of both clergy and laity was such as to make me feel that in the carrying out of any religious object I had a far broader and pleasanter foundation than that of *right* to rest upon.’ ‘The bishop, whatever may be the unreality of his legal ecclesiastical status, meets with a loyal recognition of his office, which affords opportunities of moral influence such as no mere “establishment” rank could of itself secure.’¹

Again, as with the former Bishops of Gibraltar, we find that Bishop Harris met with a most cordial reception from the bishops of the Greek Church, one of whom was ‘anxious that we should make allowance for the lack of education among the lower classes, rendering the teaching of them through pictures and “icons” a necessity.’ On one occasion, when at Constantinople, Bishop Harris found the Protosyn-cellus of the Patriarch going carefully through the Greek copy of our Prayer Book presented by the Archbishop of Canterbury, at the Patriarch’s desire, and marking sundry passages in pencil, some of which marks were removed on the Bishop explaining the difficulty which had occurred. Within little more than two years from his consecration, Bishop Harris had completed two visitation tours, in which he had twice visited the most important chaplaincies in his diocese, and had also been to several places in which no English clergyman, and much less any bishop, had ever been before, where he gathered together the few English who were to be found for prayer and for Holy Communion, travelling, during these visitations, over upwards of 22,500 miles by sea and land. Many places which had hitherto been considered as under the Bishop of London were obviously more within reach of the Bishop of Gibraltar, especially with so active an occupant of the see as Bishop Harris, and it was declared by a Foreign Office circular of November 20, 1869, that

‘the spiritual superintendence hitherto exercised by the Bishop of London over the ministers and congregations of English churches throughout Spain and Portugal, on the coast of Morocco, and in the Canary Islands, as well as over the like congregations in the kingdom of Italy, on the shores of the Black Sea, and on the Lower Danube, shall henceforth devolve on the Bishop of Gibraltar.’

¹ ‘Visitation Notes,’ *Colonial Church Chronicle*, 1869.

Such a circular, if supposed to give any jurisdiction to the bishop, would indeed have been a worse foundation than the Caroline Order in Council; but it has its value in securing for any Bishop of Gibraltar the assistance and recognition of the British consuls in any of the places named.

Bishop Harris was not, however, permitted very long to carry on his energetic work. An attack of fever at Malta, in 1872, never left him until the lungs were attacked, and he was compelled to resign the bishopric in the following year, and died at Torquay in 1874.

Dr. Sandford, Vicar of Bishopsbourne, and formerly censor of Christ Church, Oxford, who was appointed to succeed him, and is still Bishop of Gibraltar, has experienced the same friendly feelings from the Eastern Church towards the Church of England. At the dedication of the English church at Patras in 1874 fourteen Greek clergy of the neighbourhood were present, and afterwards expressed their desire for union between the two Churches. The same wish was expressed by the Archbishop of Corfu, the Archbishop of Syra and Tenos, the Patriarch of Constantinople, and other heads of the Eastern Church.¹ Reviewing the intercourse which has taken place between the English and Greek Churches since the year 1842, it must be admitted that the foundation of the see of Gibraltar has in a large measure answered the expectations which were formed of its utility in promoting Christian unity; while the condition of the English chaplaincies under the superintendence of its bishop, the increase in the number of his clergy from thirty in 1842 to sixty-five—or, including military chaplains, seventy-two—in 1877, the regular and frequent confirmations which are held, show that the Church of England, in her organisation in the South of Europe, is not discreditably represented. There is, of course, much yet to be desired in the management and services of some of the English churches; but this will be considered under another head, in common with similar needs in the North of Europe.²

Let us now consider what has been done or attempted in the way of improvement in those places which are still under the Bishop of London.

¹ Pastoral Letter from Bishop of Gibraltar, 1875.

² The history of the Jerusalem bishopric is omitted here—firstly, because it has been regarded as a missionary enterprise; and, secondly, because it may be hoped that an undertaking which was so generally disapproved by Churchmen, and which has been so complete a failure, may be regarded rather as a temporary mistake than as entering into the real history of our Church.

In 1849 Bishop Blomfield directed his attention to the unsatisfactory state of this part of his work, and issued a circular letter to thirty-one clergy in France, Belgium, and Switzerland, addressing to them questions very similar to those issued by his successor in 1861, and since addressed to to his clergy by the present Bishop of Gibraltar. At the same time the Rev. R. Burgess was requested by the Bishop to undertake the enquiry. The result may be summed up as follows:—In France there were eighteen English clergy, in Belgium six, in Switzerland four. Except two or three places set apart by Bishop Luscombe, but not secured in perpetuity, there was not a single consecrated building belonging to the Church of England in the three countries. More than half of the officiating clergy had no episcopal license of any kind, and the property and management of the chapels was generally most unsatisfactory.¹ Answers were, however, returned to the Bishop's questions in every case but one, and a general disposition was shown to accept episcopal superintendence; and small as were the immediate results of this enquiry, there is no doubt that it tended to check the practice, then so common, of men of doubtful antecedents thrusting themselves into the office of chaplain. Many were now licensed who had before been recognised by no bishop, and as the practice of holding a license became more general, it was more difficult for any clergyman who was unable to produce satisfactory testimonials to retain his position. Still, little was done to improve the character of the services, or the buildings in which they were held, while numbers of small English communities in various parts of the Continent were left without any Church provision whatever.

The attention of some of the committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel was directed to the subject in 1858, and a series of resolutions were passed at the monthly meeting on December 17 in that year, which were most excellent, but which unfortunately, owing to the want of any hearty response from those who should have been interested in the matter, may be said to have failed for the time. An interesting paper on the same subject, by the Rev. F. Meyrick, appeared in the *Colonial Church Chronicle* of the following February, which was very much repeated in substance in a paper by the same writer, read at the Oxford Church Congress in 1862. Meanwhile the Bishop of London, after

¹ *An Enquiry into the State of the Church of England in France, &c.*, by the Rev. R. Burgess, 1850.

visiting the Continent in 1861, and seeing for himself some of the evils which existed, addressed a circular letter to all foreign chaplains who could be considered as connected with his diocese, and proposed that returns should be periodically made of the matters included under certain heads of enquiry which accompanied the circular.

The replies to these enquiries show that the Church of England congregations abroad had largely increased in the interval since Bishop Blomfield's circular. From thirty-one clergy known to be ministering abroad in 1849, the number had increased to 103 in 1861, and of these ninety returned answers to the Bishop's questions, and ten who had previously sought for no episcopal recognition applied to be licensed.

The subject was taken up by Convocation in 1863, and, after it had been discussed in both houses, a committee was appointed 'to consider and report in what way the Church of England may establish and retain systematic superintendence over the congregations of her members residing in those foreign parts of Christendom with which she herself is not in communion.'² In the report presented by this committee the nature and limits of the superintendence which can be exercised by an English bishop over congregations abroad are carefully laid down.

'In countries where there are bishops of another Church holding of right territorial jurisdiction, no bishop of the Church of England would be justified, according to ecclesiastical law, in laying claim to such jurisdiction for himself. This must be borne in mind as creating an obvious difficulty in the way of any thoroughly satisfactory ecclesiastical government of English clergy in countries not subject to the English Crown. Such government can be exercised only by voluntary agreement founded on the natural desire of each congregation of Church of England worshippers not to sever itself from the ancient episcopal government which is of the essence of its Church's constitution.'

These limitations, though specially referring to the superintendence of the Bishop of London, apply equally to nearly all the chaplaincies which are under the Bishop of Gibraltar. The committee considered the possibility of the erection of a new bishopric, which should embrace the care of all foreign chaplaincies in the centre and north of Europe, but in the absence of any funds they felt it impossible to recommend

¹ Consisting of the Bishops of London and Winchester, Archdeacon Otter, Dr. Wordsworth, Dr. Jelf, and the Rev. H. Mackenzie.

² There was also a reference to provision for foreigners sojourning in England, which does not concern the subject of this article.

that any immediate steps should be taken for its formation. Beyond a general admission of the importance of the subject it cannot therefore be said that the action of Convocation led to any practical results.

Allusion was made in the report to the renewed efforts of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and to the appointment of the Continental Chaplaincies Committee to assist in the work of selecting and maintaining foreign chaplains. This committee still exists, and its action has been productive of the best results, especially in arranging with various bishops to undertake confirmation tours on behalf of the Bishop of London, the expenses of which are provided by the society. Confirmations are thus held every year in France, Belgium, and Switzerland, and every alternate year in Germany, Norway, Sweden, and Russia.

Having now reviewed the history of the Church of England on the Continent, let us see what is her position at the present time, and the claims which she may justly assert on behalf of this work to the assistance of English Churchmen both at home and abroad.

And first it will be necessary to consider a difficulty which exists in the minds of many earnest Churchmen with regard to the position of the English Church on the Continent.

It has been often asserted that an English bishop can exercise no jurisdiction in a foreign land where there are bishops of another Church holding jurisdiction; and this is indeed admitted in the Report of the Committee of Convocation already referred to. Two arguments may be used to defend the exercise both of episcopal and of all Church ministrations abroad. First, the analogy of the position of ambassadors, which rests upon what is termed by writers on international law 'extra-territoriality'—a legal fiction indeed, but one which has prevailed in all countries from the time that sovereigns have been accustomed to send ministers to represent them at Foreign Courts. So complete is the exemption of an ambassador from the local jurisdiction of the State to which he is sent, that he is supposed still to remain within the territory of his own sovereign.¹ Following upon this usage, chaplains accompanying ambassadors were allowed to minister to their fellow-countrymen long before there was anything approaching to religious liberty on the Continent; and in the case of Mr. Kennett, at Leghorn, although opposition was raised to his residing as chaplain to

the English factory, he would have been permitted to reside at Florence as chaplain to the Embassy without any interference. Secondly, it has been contended that the authority exercised by English bishops over English priests abroad rests upon the principle laid down by S. Cyprian that the function of supervising the Church is an indivisible thing, shared, indeed, by many bishops, but in such a way that each bishop has a plenary right in it as possessor of the whole.¹

It is, however, rather upon practical than theoretical grounds that the Ecclesiastical Government of English clergy in Foreign countries must be justified.

We must take facts as they are. Besides the large and yearly increasing number of English people who go abroad either for pleasure or for health, there is a very considerable permanent English population resident abroad. It is impossible to ignore their claims to the care of their mother Church. The Church of the land in which they are sojourning is one with which we are not in communion, or, as is the case in many parts of the Continent, the inhabitants of the country, though Christians, are not even members of any recognised branch of the Catholic Church. And thus it has come to pass that there have sprung up in various parts of the Continent no less than 264 congregations of the Church of England.

There are, indeed, some who maintain that when residing in a foreign country, in which there is any branch of the Catholic Church, it is their duty to attend the services of the Church of the land. We cannot, however, but regard this as a misconception of the true position and duty of English Churchmen, at least as regards that large portion of the Continent which is under the spiritual dominion of Rome.

The Church of Rome refuses communion to us unless we will renounce obedience to our own Church and confess that she is in error. A trial of this point was formally made so far back as 1842, when the Rev. W. Palmer, on June 20, sought communion of the Archbishop of Paris, exhibiting a certificate from the priest of the parish in which he had last communicated in Oxford, and countersigned by the bishop of the diocese, and was refused on the ground of our separation from the Church of Rome—a refusal which was declared by even so ardent a seeker after reunion as Mr. Palmer to make it impossible for the members of the English congregation (in

¹ *Report of Oxford Church Congress, 1862, paper by Rev. F. Meyrick.*

Paris) to obtain communion without renouncing the Church from whence they came, 'and so to clear them of all personal responsibility which might otherwise rest upon their separation.'¹ So the case stands to the present day. Communion, besides being necessary to our souls' health, is indispensable to our continuing members of the Body of Christ. The Church of Rome refuses it to us; we cannot dispense with it without grievous peril. Are we therefore to receive it under protest from the hands of an English priest, and having thus obtained what we can in no other lawful manner procure, are we then to forsake the assembling of ourselves together with our fellow-countrymen in other acts of worship, and to carry on our devotions during the remainder of the day in that Church which regards us as heretics, and refuses to accept us unless we will deny the grace which we have received? Let it be distinctly understood that this is the true position. There have been rare and unauthorised exceptions to this rule; there have been found high-minded and liberal priests of the Roman Church who would have been willing to admit Anglicans to communion, had they dared to do so; and there have been found—with shame be it spoken—Anglicans who have dared to communicate in a crowd, and thus to obtain by fraud what would otherwise have been denied to them. And while seeking in these pages to avoid matters of controversy, and to seek rather those things which make for peace, we would earnestly entreat all who are discontented with their own Church to remember that in such acts as those which we have been describing it is not merely that they are guilty of conduct which must seem even to themselves questionable, but they are disloyal to the great Head of the Church. We cannot conceive that an English Churchman who believes firmly that the Church of his fathers is a true branch of the Catholic Church can reconcile it to his conscience to ignore her in the eyes of another communion, or believe that in so doing he does no dishonour to his Lord. It is sometimes alleged as an excuse for such conduct that the provision made for English Churchmen abroad has been, and even still is often, most unsatisfactory; but let it be remembered that those who turn their backs upon their own Church are the very persons who should set an example of devotion and reverence to their fellow-countrymen, and that they might do much to help forward the work of the Church of England abroad by availing themselves of what is provided and by seeking for its improvement.

¹ *An Appeal to the Scottish Church.* Edinburgh, 1849.

Accepting, then, as we must, the necessity for English Church ministrations abroad, the necessity for episcopal supervision must follow. The alternative has been well called 'a system of insufficient presbyterianism.' If it is allowed that the functions of a priest may be exercised on behalf of English Churchmen abroad, we are at a loss to understand on what principle the functions of a bishop are to be excluded ; and it must be remembered that the case with regard to the foreign bishops is precisely the same as the relation in which we stand to the Church of Rome. 'I acknowledge no bishop but the Bishop of Nice,' said a young clergyman on the Riviera, to which the reply was obvious—'But he does not acknowledge you.' A Church which has no relation to any bishop, which is recognised by no bishop, which can bring its children to no bishop to be confirmed, cannot properly be called a Church at all. And yet, unhappily, there are still, notwithstanding the great improvement which has taken place in the condition of foreign chaplaincies, a very few which are under no episcopal control or recognition. Of these there are only two classes—those who do not seek a bishop's license because of some irregularity in their position or conduct which would prevent its being granted, and those who consider that no Anglican bishop has a right to control them. The former class has happily become very rare, and all Churchmen will heartily join in our prayer for its speedy extinction, while we would hope also that the latter may reconsider their position, and be induced to abandon an irregularity which severs them from the Church in which, by God's providence, they were born, and of which they still profess to be members. Nothing can be more important at the present time, when there is an increasing desire for the restoration of the unity of the Church of Christ, than that the Church of England should be efficiently represented in foreign lands ; and it would indeed be sad if any of those who would perhaps be likely to possess the greatest influence, and to exhibit the pure worship of our Church in its greatest beauty and dignity, should present at the same time any spectacle of disunion by their separation from episcopal control. 'The most important ground,' to quote the words of the late Bishop Hamilton when speaking on this subject, 'is the aspect which our beloved Church should present to those Churches which are not in communion with us.' And we may here add his opinion with regard to episcopal control. 'The case is altogether exceptional ; the circumstances are extraordinary, and we are obliged in some way or other to adapt ourselves to existing ecclesiastical

arrangements.¹ It will be observed that out of 264 foreign chaplaincies 199² are still under the superintendence of the Bishop of London. Owing, as we have seen, to the care of the Continental Committee of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, confirmations are regularly arranged for these chaplaincies; but they are seldom, if ever, held by the bishop whose work it is supposed to be; and it cannot, therefore, be regarded as an arrangement which is wholly satisfactory. The greatest trial in the life of every foreign chaplain is his isolation, and the visit of a bishop, if he were indeed his own bishop, would tend greatly to cheer and encourage him in his work. The disadvantage which attaches to all infrequent episcopal visits even in England is therefore conspicuous in a still greater degree. The visit of a bishop is a little too like the visit of a school inspector—with the disadvantage that the school is not examined. A congregation looks its best, musters its strongest, sings its best, responds its loudest; and it is to be feared that a bishop often goes away well satisfied when in truth a dead or half-sleeping body has only been galvanised into a kind of spasmodic life. And the only remedy is for a bishop really to know his clergy and to possess their confidence, to visit their churches frequently and to know something of their flocks. We wonder how many foreign chaplains have ever even seen the Bishop of London; the number certainly cannot be large, nor can any fault attach to a bishop who is already so over-burdened. Owing to the confirmation tours provided by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, matters are not so bad as they were thirty years ago, when a foreign chaplain could write, 'During my long residence of nearly a quarter of a century, I have never had the pleasure of seeing one of our spiritual fathers.'³ We might take a lesson from the American Church, which has never allowed any of her clergy to minister in foreign lands without direct episcopal superintendence; one of the bishops being from time to time appointed to undertake this office, although there are not a dozen American churches in Europe.

But it is extraordinary that, with all the extension of the episcopate which has taken place, nothing has been done for our scattered Continental churches. It certainly has not arisen from the difficulty of ecclesiastical jurisdiction abroad, although that difficulty has of course been felt; but when two such

¹ *Chronicle of Convocation*, 1863, p. 1157.

² Including stations occupied during a portion of the year.

³ *The English Church on the Continent*, edited by the Rev. G. E. Biber, LL.D., 1846, p. 23.

authorities as the late Bishops of Winchester and Salisbury insisted as they did upon the actual necessity for, and absolute importance of, such a work, it is astonishing, and not very creditable, that no steps have been taken to supply a want which has been so long felt. If it is thought necessary that the Isle of Man, with its forty-five clergy, should possess the privilege of exclusive episcopal care, surely the clergy and congregations on the Continent should not be left practically without a bishop. Nor would any greater difficulty occur as to jurisdiction than exists at present if the proposal—made long since, and advocated both by Bishop Sumner and Bishop Wilberforce—were carried out of separating the Channel Islands¹ from the diocese of Winchester, and joining to the duties of their bishop the superintendence of the Church of England chaplaincies on the Continent. With regard to the present condition of foreign chaplaincies, we have seen that much has been done. They have increased largely in numbers; they have increased in efficiency, and in the character of their clergy. Nor must we fail to acknowledge that, in addition to the benefits which resulted from the circular letters and enquiries of Bishop Blomfield and his successor, much good has been effected, up to a certain point, by the Colonial and Continental Church Society. They have multiplied chaplaincies, and they have at least secured to them the ministrations of clergy of unimpeachable personal character. And yet, while acknowledging the good work which they have done, we must regret that such a work has been left to this society to perform, because we cannot feel that it has sought to represent the Church of England as a branch of the Catholic Church, as one which claims to the full as high a position as an integral portion of the Church of Christ as that which the Church of Rome arrogates to herself alone. An extract from a recent report of this society will speak for itself. The report of the chaplain at Lyons is thus prefaced:—

‘It will be seen that he delights to co-operate in every possible way with the Protestants of Lyons and their *pasteurs*. Where this is the case there is no fear of the Church of England being looked on, as she is too often by foreign Protestants, with suspicion, or of her true character as a Protestant Church being forgotten.’

Probably few of the supporters of this society know much of Protestantism in France, but even from their point of view they would feel alarm if they were aware of the divisions

¹ The Channel Islands alone possess a population of 90,563, with forty-nine clergy.

which exist among its followers. That sacraments are depreciated and administered by those who have no more right to such a ministry than any layman in England might, we fear, be considered as of little account by those who are ready to co-operate with the ministrations of Dissenters at home; but that Socinianism should be openly preached in many French Protestant chapels, that doubts should be cast upon the truth of the miracles, upon the articles of the Christian faith as expressed in the Apostles' Creed, upon the Divinity of our Lord—this would possibly be a surprise to them. And yet it is with French Protestants that the Colonial and Continental Church Society delights to co-operate, regardless of the sacrifice of Church principles, so long as they may join in a protesting attitude towards Rome. We cannot wonder that many Romanists on the Continent express surprise when they find that we are Christians, because they do not concede this name to many of their Protestant countrymen.¹ And although we cannot but suppose that the chaplains of this society avoid those *pasteurs* who are known to be Socinians, and co-operate only with those who, though lax in doctrine and discipline, and possessing no orders, are yet earnest and sincere believers in Christ, we have no assurance to this effect, and are rather left to infer that, whatever their chaplains may find out for themselves, the society at home supposes all kinds of Protestantism to be equally good.

Nor is it possible to feel satisfied with the provision made by this society for the services of our Church, which are presented generally, not in the simplicity of her own Catholic worship, but depressed very much below her level. Daily services and weekly Communion are rarely to be found in any chaplaincy connected with this society; and however strongly we deprecate the abandonment of their own Church by English people because they do not find what they might justly look for, it is unhappily the case that many have been induced to worship in the churches of the Roman communion because of the inadequate provision in their own. One case certainly existed within the last two years, in which the ministrations provided by this society were confined to a single

¹ A friend of the writer's relates the following recent experience :—
'At a *pension* at Evian-les-Bains I met several well-educated French people—lawyers and others. We conversed on the subject of religion, and they were all astonished to hear that we used and accepted the *Apostles' Creed*, that we claimed episcopal succession from the Apostles, and believed the miraculous birth of our Lord from a virgin. They thought we were "Protestants."

afternoon service on Sunday, with an occasional celebration of the Holy Communion at the same time. The frequent practice of holding these services in the French Protestant chapels leads many, naturally, to attend the French services, where, as we have shown, they may hear such questionable teaching, but which, as we have been often told, they find so good as a lesson in French. The use of German and Swiss chapels is generally open to the same objections.

That there are difficulties to contend with, all who have ever filled the office of a foreign chaplain must be well aware. Sometimes the only place available for service is a room in an hotel, and arrangements must be specially made upon each occasion, but even then the services may be orderly and reverent, if requisite care be taken. No clergyman abroad, any more than in a country parish at home, should be above acting as his own sacristan, and no man is fit to minister abroad who will not give personal attention to all the details of each office. For want of this we often hear complaints of the slovenliness of English services; and the deep injury caused to our Church not merely with Englishmen, but in the eyes of members of other communions, is greater than is generally imagined. Quite recently we heard of a case in which, after a service held in the *salon* of an hotel, the vessels used for the Holy Communion were left lying about uncleansed during the remainder of the day, to the annoyance and disgust of some who were present.

There is indeed little excuse not only for such gross want of reverence, but for the use of hotel *salons*, as there are few cases in which the landlord of an hotel will not give, or at all events let for a moderate rent, a room to be set apart for the English Church. Unfortunately, those who are sent abroad to serve what are known as summer or season chaplaincies have often no knowledge of the Continent or of the language of the country in which they are placed; and, however legitimately these chaplaincies may be allowed to assist hard-working clergy to a holiday abroad, it is most desirable that no one should be appointed to any chaplaincy in which no place is set apart for service who is not qualified, both by experience and by his knowledge of the language, to negotiate for the separate use of some room or building for the purpose.

The work which has been done by the Colonial and Continental Society has been due to the liberal support which has been given, not by congregations abroad, but by subscribers at home; and were English clergymen to contribute as liberally to the Continental Chaplaincies Fund of the Society for

the Propagation of the Gospel, they would not so often hear complaints as to English services abroad. A most important work, besides the mere support of foreign chaplaincies, is the building of churches in which the services may be rendered with fitting solemnity and reverence. The Propagation Society is able to accept the trust of such buildings, and it is impossible to find any equally satisfactory tenure of the property of the Church in all parts of the Continent.

There is ample room for the operations of both these societies, and we rejoice that they are working harmoniously at the present time, no new chaplaincy being undertaken by either without previous reference by the Bishop of London to the other society. We would not willingly depreciate any good work, and we trust that the Colonial and Continental Society, which has accomplished so much, may show itself more distinctly a *Church* society, an aspiration which we believe to be shared by some of its own chaplains. It is impossible to over-estimate the importance of the work of our Church abroad, and we need there, fully as much as in England, to show a united front against the rapid growth of infidelity. 'La religion n'est que l'immoralité,' was the hasty utterance of an educated Frenchman to the writer of these pages some years ago, and similar sentiments are too often to be heard on the Continent to-day. They are a cruel slander against a large body of devoted priests, but they are founded on a germ of truth which has borne bitter fruit. With such discontent against the clergy, and increasing assumptions and intolerance of the Papacy, unbelief has spread widely over Continental Europe. 'Je ne veux pas,' said a pious Frenchman lately, 'qu'un professeur dise à mon fils, "Demain je vais vous instruire comment créer Dieu."' Ultramontanism on one side, infidelity on the other, a divided and often rationalising Protestantism struggling between them—such is the unhappy aspect which is presented in France, in Switzerland, in Germany, and, though possibly in a lesser degree, in other European nations. May it not be the office of the English Church to preserve the true faith in the midst of heresy and disunion? 'She preserves the entire faith, such as our Lord left it with the Apostles, to evangelise the world. She believes all which the undivided Church believed, as of faith.'¹ May she be so faithful to her high calling that when in God's providence the scattered members of Christ's Body, awakened possibly by the perils of utter apostasy which are without, shall lay aside

¹ *The Truth and Office of the English Church.* By E. B. Pusey, p. 259.
VOL. V.—NO. X. C C

their unnatural and unhappy divisions, and concentrate their whole strength against the common foe of their Lord and of their brethren, our beloved Church may be the centre to which all may turn, and in which they may find preserved to them the rich treasure of the faith once delivered to the saints.

ART. V.—READINGS ON THE TABLES IN THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER FOR FINDING EASTER.

1. *The Prayer Book Interleaved.* (Rivingtons, 1873.)
2. *Astronomy without Mathematics.* By Sir EDMUND BECKETT, Bart.
3. *Some Observations on Easter Tide, suggesting and advocating a Change in the Mode of Determining the Paschal Limits.* By the Rev. J. NEWLAND SMITH. (Longmans, 1872-1873.)
4. *General Proof of Gauss' Rule for finding Easter Day.* By SAMUEL BUTCHER, D.D., Bishop of Meath.

PART I.

IT is somewhat remarkable how difficult it is to find any simple explanation of the Prayer Book tables for finding Easter. Dr. Stephens, in his edition of the Prayer Book, gives none. Wheatly¹ is not exact enough. Sir Edmund Beckett² and Professor de Morgan³ (and the *Prayer Book Interleaved*, which, in fact, is only an echo of de Morgan), the Lord Macclesfield of 1750,⁴ and even the encyclopedias, are in general too scientific or condensed. And yet the subject is a little too technical for everyone to be his own interpreter, so that it may be no waste either of our space or our trouble to offer as intelligible an account as we can of these important tables.

‘TABLES AND RULES

‘*For the moveable and Immoveable Feasts . . . through the whole Year.*

‘*Rules to know when the Moveable Feasts and Holy Days begin.*

‘Easter Day (on which the rest depend) is always the First Sunday after the Full Moon which happens upon, or next after, the Twenty-

¹ *On the Book of Common Prayer.*

² *Astronomy without Mathematics.*

³ *Companion to the Almanac.*

⁴ *Philosophical Transactions*, 1750.

first Day of March ; and if the Full Moon happens upon a Sunday, Easter Day is the Sunday after.'

Why is Easter a moveable feast ? It would have saved a number of difficult astronomical and other questions if, like the Epiphany, it had been immoveable and fixed on the same day of every year. It is not the actual anniversary of the Resurrection now, any more than it would have been then.

'The Paschal moon often differs from the true equinoctial moon by a day or two, and Easter may be a week, or even five weeks, earlier than it would be if it followed the real moon. Indeed, unless an "Easter meridian" were agreed on for the whole world, it might still differ five weeks in different places in the same country, even if it were fixed by astronomers, and therefore made incalculable either forwards or backwards by anyone else. For if there is full moon in London very early in the morning of Saturday, March 21, Easter would be the next day there ; but that same full moon may be on Friday night of March 20 at Exeter or Oxford, by true time, and therefore would not be the Paschal moon there, which would be on Sunday, April 19, and Easter not till April 26, which it never is now.'¹

Mr. Newland Smith has well pointed out the simplifications which would have resulted had Easter been an immoveable feast (always provided it be a Sunday), not depending on the moon, 'whose guidance with her borrowed light is not so well suited to determine with precision and ease any annually recurring epoch of time' as

'the sun, which among civilised nations now regulates the year in every instance, save only in this ecclesiastical arrangement. The great Sunday, on which the Sun of Righteousness arose, should be associated with that heavenly body which the Almighty Agent of creation made the real regulator of our material system, as He is the real regulator of our spiritual system—the sun material and the Sun spiritual, each in his respective sphere, being the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.'²

It is true, adds Mr. Smith, in combating the objections that would be urged against the change, 'that superstition ever has votaries ; but Diana has, in this case, no silver shrine-makers whose "craft is in danger."³

April 7 has been very generally held, and that on sufficiently good grounds, to be the very day on which our Blessed Lord's crucifixion took place, and therefore Mr. Smith would choose the real Easter Day—April 9—as the *terminus a quo*

¹ *Astronomy without Mathematics*, p. 146.

² *Some Observations on Easter Tide, suggesting and advocating a Change in the Mode of Determining the Paschal Limits.* By Rev. J. N. Smith (Longmans, 1872), p. 10.

³ *Ibid.* p. 12.

for the new Paschal limits, and April 15 as the *terminus ad quem*. Or, fixing it more precisely, as he does in his second pamphlet (1873), he would make Easter Day the second Sunday in April. Short as these limits are, they would include the fourteenth day of the month (Nisan), a day for which the quaterdeciman controversy shows that there has been, and therefore that there will probably still be, felt some considerable regard, and the inclusion of which might satisfy that not unnatural desire to continue in some sort a connection between Easter Day and the Day of the Passover.¹

With many of Mr. Smith's remarks, which are written in a pleasant and popular style, and yet in one greatly becoming a Churchman and a clergyman, we can fully concur. It is quite another thing when we come to the matter of his proposal; and as such a revolution as changing the computation of Easter is altogether outside the range of serious discussion, it is quite worth our while to understand the existing method, notwithstanding his denunciation of it as

'Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum,'

but which we have to obey and conform to, and should therefore understand.

Easter is not, then, an immoveable feast; but why not? Because it depends on the motion of the moon, which does not come round to have its changes (*i.e.* become 'new' again) on the same day of *each* solar year. Why does Easter depend on the moon? Because the Jewish Passover did, and it is the object of the Christian Church to celebrate Easter at the same *time*, though not (as we shall presently see) on the same *day*, as the Passover. The Jews reckoned their years by lunar months, and their Passover happened on the 14th day, or full moon, of their month Nisan (afterwards Abib), which corresponds to part of our March and April, and was ordained by God Himself to be the 'first month of their year' (Ex. xiii. 2). It began with the new moon next to (*i.e.* next after) the vernal equinox. The equinox is the time when the sun's apparent path in the heavens (*i.e.* the ecliptic) crosses or intersects the earth's equator; and as two circles, as the ecliptic and equator are, cannot cut one another in more than two places, or twice, the equinoxes occur only twice every year—viz. in spring and autumn. How, then, did the Jews know each year *when* it was the vernal equinox? Perhaps it was at that time that God gave them the above command, and then they would only have to note (which they did, by observation from the

¹ *Some Observations on Easter Tide, suggesting and advocating a Change in the Mode of Determining the Paschal Limits.* By Rev. J. N. Smith (Longmans, 1873).

tops of the mountains, and with blowings of trumpets, without any astronomical calculations) the new moon next to *that* vernal equinox, and then, by continuing a succession of periodical observations, they might note the return of each vernal equinox for ever. They would know, moreover, by the equal distribution of light and darkness (*i.e.* of day and night) *when*—though not, perhaps, the exact day when—the equinoxes occurred; and they would distinguish the spring from the autumn one, by the lengthening, instead of the shortening, of the daylight. The point is rather obscure, but the third moon after that succeeding the winter solstice would no doubt be considered that of Nisan. The Greeks, however, determined the equinox pretty accurately. It is a simple observation to find when the sun is on the equator; and, as its declination changes about that time 23' a day, an observer could scarcely make the error of a day. Of course it might happen any time in the day or night.

The vernal equinox was, therefore, to be taken by the Christian Church as their starting-point in fixing the time of Easter. An Apostolic canon about the time of Pope Victor deposed presbyters and deacons who kept the Day of the Holy Pasch before the vernal equinox;¹ and the first canon of the Council of Nicæa, 325 A.D. (which composed the different practices as to the time of keeping Easter, and has ever since regulated it) is often² spoken of as having laid down that March 21 should be '*accounted*' the vernal equinox. Yet this is not a correct description of the proceedings of the Council. It laid down nothing about the vernal equinox. It left the moon to be found as it might be.³ It simply said that Easter Day should be on a Sunday, and observed everywhere on the same day. The Council did not direct by what means the day should be determined; and hence, although Easter was everywhere kept on a Sunday, the reckonings of different Churches varied sometimes to the extent of a month or more. The science of Alexandria gave the law to the Eastern Churches in general, and in the sixteenth century the Alexandrian calculation was adopted at Rome.⁴ The calculation, however, *if* the Council had really made it, would have been at the time correct, with the exception of an error too trifling to mention, though, as we shall presently see, it would not have been true to affirm that it would be correct for ever; for (following, as the early Church did, the Julian

¹ Bingham's Works, vol. vii. p. 306.

² E.g. Wheatly, *On the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 37.

³ Robertson's *History of the Christian Church*, p. 364.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 360.

computation of a year) from March 21 in any year to March 21 in the next year was a period of 365 days 6 hours, whereas from one real vernal equinox to the next was a period of 365 d. 5 h. 48 min. 49·7 sec.—*i.e.* there was a difference, between the Julian solar year and the true year, of 11 min. 10·3 sec. a year. This difference is called the 'solar error,' and in 1,257 years (the interval between the Council of Nicæa, 325 A.D., and the reformation of the calendar by Pope Gregory, 1582 A.D.) had amounted to ten days; in other words, March 21 (*i.e.* of the year) no longer happened at the exact time of the vernal equinox, but had fallen ten days *behind* it; so that, to bring it and the equinox together again, ten days had to be suppressed in the calendar, or, in other words, the solar year, like a slow clock, had to be pushed forward that number of days. This difference of ten days had, in 1752—when we in England adopted the Gregorian reformation, or 'new style,'—amounted to eleven days, which number of whole days was accordingly suppressed next after September 2 in that year (the day following the 2nd becoming the 13th).

'*If the Full Moon happens on a Sunday, Easter Day is the Sunday after.*'—This is to guard against the possibility of Easter Day occurring, and being celebrated, on the very day of the Passover. This coincidence, however, so repugnant to the feelings of a Christian and the character of the day, cannot, we are told, always be avoided; and it will occur next in the year 1903.

'*From the Present Time*'—*i.e.* from the 24 Geo. II. (the time when the tables were inserted in the Prayer Book—*i.e.* the time of our adoption of the new style in England in 1752).

'*According to the foregoing Calendar.*'—So much of the calendar is here set out as extends from the day (March 21) next before the earliest day (March 22) on which Easter Day can fall, down to the latest (April 25).

'*To find which, look for the Golden Number.*'

What are the golden numbers? They are numbers designed to show, and which do show, the place which the solar year occupies in a lunar cycle of nineteen years. 'They mean, that the day against the golden number of the year is the day of Paschal moon, or full moon next before Easter Sunday.¹ The important discovery of this cycle was made by Meton, an Athenian, about B.C. 432. He observed that the moon always comes round to have her 'changes' (*i.e.* become new again) on the same *day* of the solar year as she had had them just nineteen years before.² He had, then, only to construct a table or

¹ *Astronomy without Mathematics*, p. 149.

² Why this is so, is one of the abstruser problems of astronomy

cycle, as he did (called the 'lunar cycle') of nineteen numbers, each representing a year, and to note on what days of the solar year the new moons of the 1st year of his cycle happened (which he probably did, as the Jews did, by observation, or calculation from preceding moons); and following this out by the same means through each year of his cycle, the *days* of the new (and therefore of the full) moon could be found out at a glance for ever, subject to certain corrections presently to be explained.

A TABLE TO FIND EASTER DAY,

From the Present Time till the Year 1899 inclusive, according to the foregoing Calendar.

Golden Number	Days of the Month	Sunday Letter															
XIV.	Mar. 21	C	<p>This table contains so much of the Calendar as is necessary for the determining of Easter; to find which, look for the Golden Number of the year in the first column of the Table, against which stands the day of the Paschal full moon; then look in the third column for the Sunday Letter next after the day of the full moon, and the day of the month standing against that Sunday Letter [in the second column] is Easter Day. If the full moon happens upon a Sunday, then (according to the first rule) the next Sunday is Easter Day.</p> <p>To find the Golden Number, or Prime, add 1 to the year of our Lord, and then divide by 19; the remainder, if any, is the Golden Number; but if nothing remaineth, then 19 is the Golden Number.</p> <p>To find the Dominical or Sunday Letter, according to the Calendar, until the year 1799 inclusive, add to the year of our Lord its fourth part, omitting fractions, and also the number 1: divide the sum by 7; and if there is no remainder, then A is the Sunday Letter; but if any number remaineth, then the Letter standing against that number in the small annexed table, is the Sunday Letter.</p> <p>For the next century, that is, from the year 1800 till the year 1899 inclusive, add to the current year only its fourth part, and then divide by 7, and proceed as in the last rule.</p> <p>Note, that in Bissextile or Leap Years, the letter found as above will be the Sunday Letter, from the intercalated day exclusive, to the end of the year.</p> <table><tr><td>0</td><td>A</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>G</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>F</td></tr><tr><td>3</td><td>E</td></tr><tr><td>4</td><td>D</td></tr><tr><td>5</td><td>C</td></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>B</td></tr></table>	0	A	1	G	2	F	3	E	4	D	5	C	6	B
0	A																
1	G																
2	F																
3	E																
4	D																
5	C																
6	B																
III.	— 22	D															
	— 23	E															
XI.	— 24	F															
	— 25	G															
XIX.	— 26	A															
VIII.	— 27	B															
	— 28	C															
XVI.	— 29	D															
V.	— 30	E															
	— 31	F															
XIII.	April 1	G															
II.	— 2	A															
	— 3	B															
X.	— 4	C															
	— 5	D															
XVIII.	— 6	E															
VII.	— 7	F															
	— 8	G															
XV.	— 9	A															
IV.	— 10	B															
	— 11	C															
XII.	— 12	D															
I.	— 13	E															
	— 14	F															
IX.	— 15	G															
	— 16	A															
XVII.	— 17	B															
VI.	— 18	C															
	— 19	D															
	— 20	E															
	— 21	F															
	— 22	G															
	— 23	A															
	— 24	B															
	— 25	C															

depending on the spiral nature of the moon's orbit, its ellipticity, and its inclination to the ecliptic, on which we do not propose to enter here.

These numbers, which are called indiscriminately the 'prime' and 'golden,' from their great use (the Athenians inscribing them on pillars in golden letters), were, until A.D. 1752, placed in most of our Prayer Books against all those days in each calendar month on which, for a limited period, *there could be a full moon during the cycle*; but they are now placed only against such of those days as are within the 'Paschal limits' (*i.e.* between March 21 and April 18), so called because the full moon which is to govern Easter cannot, as we have seen, fall before the former, nor after the latter, day. We have only, then, to find what year of Meton's cycle the given year is in, and we know that the Paschal full moon occurs on that day of the calendar month against which, in the above table, that year of the cycle is set.

The rule for finding the golden number in the foregoing table, and which, it is to be observed, holds good for any century, may be thus formulated:—

$$\left(\frac{y + 1}{19}\right)r,$$

where y stands for the current year, and r for the remainder from the division, which remainder, if any, is the golden number; if no remainder, 19 is.

'Add one to the year of our Lord.'—Because A.D. 1, which was at first supposed to be the year of the *birth* of our Lord, but was really four years after it, was always considered year 2 of the cycle¹—*i.e.* one year of the cycle had been completed; for, placing Meton's discovery in B.C. 432, and calling that year the seventh of the cycle (that being, for some now unexplained reason, adopted publicly for the introduction of the golden number), and counting onwards, B.C. 1 = year 1 of the cycle, and A.D. 1 = year 2 of it.

Therefore, when we say that the date of the Crucifixion was—as from the Sacred History itself and other records it probably was—A.D. 30, we mean it occurred in the thirty-fourth year after that in which our Lord was born. The system in use is called the 'vulgar era,' and any date in the 'vulgar era,' increased by four years, is the true era, and is the date which would have been in use, if we had called the birth of our Lord A.D. 1 instead of B.C. 4. April 9, A.D. 30, was, then, the true Easter Day; for our Lord being born B.C. 4, and being thirty years old when He began His ministry, which lasted three years, He must have suffered A.D. 30, for He would not

¹ Professor de Morgan.

be thirty years old until A.D. 27. As to *the day* of the year, Dr. Wordsworth suggests it has been designedly hidden by the Holy Spirit to teach men humility; but we can ascertain it as certainly as we can the year. We may *assume*, Mr. Smith thinks, that it was between March 20 and April 23, and we *know* it was on Friday, and that there was a full moon. Now astronomy, eliminating A.D. 29 and 34, as having no full moon at the required time, shows that there was a full moon on April 6, between 9 and 10 P.M., A.D. 30, though April 6 was not, as Mr. Greswell says, on a Saturday, but on a Thursday. There was, it is true, a moon which would do, in A.D. 33, but that year would not fulfil the conditions of our Lord's age above referred to.¹

Now, the lunar cycle is itself about $1\frac{1}{2}$ hour (or, speaking exactly, 1 h. 28 min. 8 sec.) too long; in other words, too slow, as compared with the true astronomical moon (which of course is the only real measure of time), the moon really coming round to have her 'changes' that much sooner every nineteen years than she had had them in the previous cycle, a difference which amounts to about one day in 308 years (or eight days in twenty-five centuries); and this error in the cycle is called the 'lunar error.'

The golden numbers, therefore, as they are now prefixed to the calendar, only hold good *in their present places* there until 1900 A.D., when a change will be necessary to be made in those places. Such change from 1900 to 2199 A.D.,² and indeed generally,³ is given in the Prayer Book, as we shall have occasion presently to consider.

'Then look in the third Column for the Sunday Letter.'

—What is the Sunday letter? and what is its use? The

¹ Mr. Smith shows Mr. Greswell's mistake thus:—

'The number of days from (say) March 29, 1873, to April 6, A.D. 30 (both inclusive), are—

	For 30 A.D.	=	270
	For 31 A.D.	=	365
From end of 31 A.D. to end of 1871 A.D.			
($1840 \times 365 + 460 - 12$ (for leap years			
and difference of style))		=	672,048
	For 1872 A.D.	=	366
	For 1873 A.D.	=	88
		7)	673,137
			96,162 weeks and 3 days.

And as each week ends with a Saturday, each begins with a Sunday; therefore April 6 must have been three days before a Sunday—*i.e.* a Thursday.

² See *post*.

³ See *post*.

Council of Nicæa required Easter Day to be on the *Sunday* after the Paschal full moon.

Now, the Sunday letter, when discovered and placed against the calendar, shows what days in a given year *are* Sundays. The Sunday letter is thus discovered. The first seven letters of the alphabet are (arbitrarily) chosen to designate the seven days of the week, and, beginning with A against January 1, are ranged in the second column of the calendar opposite each day of each calendar month throughout the year, except against February 29. Consequently, as in ordinary years there are 365 whole days (or fifty-two weeks and one day over), A appears opposite December 31 as well as against January 1. Therefore, if A be the Sunday (or Dominical) letter for any one year, G will be the Sunday letter for the next year, F for the next, and so on, the letters occurring always in a retrograde order. For December 31 being, in ordinary years, on the same day of the week as January 1 of the same year, supposing A to be the Sunday letter of (say) 1865 (as it was), January 1, 1866, was on a Monday, January 2 on a Tuesday, and so on, which would bring January 7 (a Sunday) opposite to G in the calendar, which accordingly became the Sunday letter for 1866.

'Note, that in all Bissextile or Leap Years,' &c.—We have said that no letter is found in the calendar opposite February 29, 'the intercalary day.' The Sunday letter for a leap year is thus provided:—As in an ordinary year the odd single day above fifty-two weeks makes (as we have seen) the Sunday letter of the following year to shift from that which it was in the previous year to the next letter in a backward order, so in a leap year, a day being intercalated at the end of February, the Sunday letter is made after February in such year, and throughout the remainder of such year, to shift from that which it was till then to the next letter in a backward order; *e.g.* if (as is the case) in 1876 (B being the Sunday letter for the first part of the year) February 27 is a Sunday, March 5 will be the next Sunday of that year, which will have A for its Sunday letter throughout the remainder of it.

Thus there are two Sunday letters in every leap year set side by side of each other, the left-hand one standing for and showing the days which are Sundays from January 1 to February 29 inclusive in that year, and the right-hand one those which are Sundays during the remainder of the year. And as the Paschal full moon occurs during this remainder, the right-hand letter is alone considered as the real Sunday letter, and regarded in the division which takes place for

finding the Sunday letter in the table under consideration. Thus the letters for 1876 come out, as we have said, B A (*i.e.* A); for, by the above rule for finding the Sunday letter for the present century, there being no remainder, O equals A by the above 'small annexed table' on p. 103. The Sunday letter is said to have 'leaped' from C—the Sunday letter of the previous year—to A, and the year 1876 is called 'leap year.' Leap years are called bissextile, because the sixth day (*sextilis*)—February 24—before the Calends (or March 1) used to be repeated twice (*bis*), the intercalary day being inserted between that day and February 23, which was the end of the old Roman year. A *general* table to find the Sunday letter for *any* year is given, and will be considered, presently.¹

ANOTHER TABLE TO FIND EASTER

Till the Year 1899 inclusive.

Golden Number	SUNDAY LETTERS						
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
I.	April 16	— 17	— 18	19	— 20	— 14	— 15
II.	April 9	— 3	— 4	5	— 6	— 7	— 8
III.	Mar. 26	— 27	— 28	29	— 23	— 24	— 25
IV.	April 16	— 17	— 11	12	— 13	— 14	— 15
V.	April 2	— 3	— 4	5	— 6	Mar. 31	April 1
VI.	April 23	— 24	— 25	19	— 20	— 21	— 22
VII.	April 9	— 10	— 11	12	— 13	— 14	— 8
VIII.	April 2	— 3	Mar. 28	29	— 30	— 31	April 1
IX.	April 16	— 17	— 18	19	— 20	— 21	— 22
X.	April 9	— 10	— 11	5	— 6	— 7	— 8
XI.	Mar. 26	— 27	— 28	29	— 30	— 31	— 25
XII.	April 16	— 17	— 18	19	— 13	— 14	— 15
XIII.	April 2	— 3	— 4	5	— 6	— 7	— 8
XIV.	Mar. 26	— 27	— 28	22	— 23	— 24	— 25
XV.	April 16	— 10	— 11	12	— 13	— 14	— 15
XVI.	April 2	— 3	— 4	5	Mar. 30	— 31	April 1
XVII.	April 23	— 24	— 18	19	— 20	— 21	— 22
XVIII.	April 9	— 10	— 11	12	— 13	— 7	— 8
XIX.	April 2	Mar. 27	— 28	29	— 30	— 31	April 1

To make use of the preceding table, find the Sunday Letter for the year in the uppermost line, and the Golden Number, or Prime, in the column of Golden Numbers, and against the Prime, in the same line under the Sunday Letter you have the day of the month on which Easter falleth that year. But note that the name of the month is set on the left hand, or just with the figure, and followeth not, as in other tables, by descent, but collateral.

¹ See *post*.

The Sunday letters would come round to be the same again every seven years, were there no 'leap' years; but this not being the case, they would come round again in 7×4 or twenty-eight years (and so they did in the old style), were it not for the accumulating 'solar error,' which is only set right, as mentioned presently, once in every four hundred years. They do, however, come round again to be the same in, and not till, that period of time, which is therefore the complete Sunday cycle of the Gregorian calendar; for it fortunately happens that that number (400) contains a number of days—146,097 (or 20,871 weeks)—which is an exact multiple of seven, the number of the Sunday letters. They *appear* to come round again to be the same (in the 'Table of Moveable Feasts for Fifty-two Years,' mentioned presently¹) every twenty-eight years, but that is because that period is too short to include any centenary year. If it did include it, it would be seen that, unless that year was a *bissextile* centenary year (which it is once only in every four hundred years), there would be only one Sunday letter against that centenary year, which would accordingly throw out the order of the letters and prevent their recurrence.

The Sunday letter is to be found as in the preceding table, and so of the golden number.

'*Just with*'—i.e. even, or on the same line with the figure; and is read, not (as usually) vertically but, laterally.

¹ See opposite page.

PART II.

A TABLE OF THE MOVEABLE FEASTS

For Fifty-two Years, according to the foregoing Calendar.

The Year of our Lord	Golden Number	The Epact	Sunday Letter	Sundays after Epiphany	Septuagesima Sunday	First Day of Lent	Easter Day	Rogation Sunday	Ascension Day	Whit Sunday	Sundays after Trinity	Advent Sunday
1838	15	4	G	5	Feb. 11	Feb. 28	April 15	May 20	May 24	June 3	24	Dec. 2
1839	16	15	F	5	Jan. 27	— 13	Mar. 31	— 5	— 9	May 19	26	— 1
1840	17	26	ED	5	Feb. 16	Mar. 4	April 19	— 24	— 28	June 7	23	Nov. 29
1841	18	7	C	4	— 7	Feb. 24	— 11	— 16	— 20	May 30	— 28	— 28
1842	19	18	C	4	Jan. 23	— 9	Mar. 27	— 1	— 5	— 15	26	— 27
1843	1	0	A	5	Feb. 12	Mar. 1	April 16	— 21	— 25	June 4	24	Dec. 3
1844	2	11	GF	4	Feb. 21	— 4	Feb. 21	— 7	— 12	May 26	25	— 1
1845	3	22	E	4	Jan. 19	— 5	Mar. 23	April 27	— 1	— 11	27	Nov. 30
1846	4	3	D	4	Feb. 8	— 25	April 12	May 17	— 21	— 31	24	— 29
1847	5	14	C	3	Jan. 31	— 17	— 4	— 9	— 13	— 23	25	— 28
1848	6	25	BA	3	Feb. 20	Mar. 8	— 23	— 28	June 1	June 11	23	Dec. 3
1849	7	6	F	4	— 4	Feb. 21	— 8	— 13	May 17	May 27	— 2	— 2
1850	8	17	G	5	Jan. 27	— 13	Mar. 31	— 5	— 9	— 19	26	— 1
1851	9	28	E	5	Feb. 16	Mar. 5	April 20	— 25	— 29	June 8	23	Nov. 30
1852	10	9	DC	4	— 8	Feb. 25	— 11	— 16	— 20	May 30	— 24	— 28
1853	11	20	A	5	Jan. 23	— 9	Mar. 27	— 1	— 5	— 15	26	— 27
1854	12	1	B	4	Feb. 12	Mar. 1	April 16	— 21	— 25	June 4	24	Dec. 3
1855	13	12	G	4	— 4	Feb. 21	— 8	— 13	— 17	May 27	— 25	— 2
1856	14	23	FE	1	Jan. 20	— 6	Mar. 23	April 27	— 1	— 11	27	Nov. 30
1857	15	4	D	4	Feb. 8	— 25	April 12	May 17	— 21	— 31	24	— 29
1858	16	15	C	3	Jan. 31	— 17	— 4	— 9	— 13	— 23	25	— 28
1859	17	26	B	6	Feb. 20	Mar. 9	— 24	— 28	June 2	June 12	23	— 27
1860	18	7	AG	4	— 5	Feb. 22	— 8	— 13	May 17	May 27	— 25	Dec. 2
1861	19	18	F	5	Jan. 27	— 13	Mar. 31	— 5	— 9	— 19	26	— 1
1862	1	0	E	5	Feb. 16	Mar. 5	April 20	— 25	— 29	June 8	23	Nov. 30
1863	2	11	D	3	— 1	Feb. 18	— 5	— 10	— 14	May 24	— 25	— 29
1864	3	22	CB	2	Jan. 24	— 10	Mar. 27	— 1	— 5	— 15	26	— 27
1865	4	3	A	5	Feb. 12	Mar. 1	April 16	— 21	— 25	June 4	24	Dec. 3
1866	5	14	G	5	Jan. 28	Feb. 14	— 1	— 6	— 10	May 20	— 26	— 2
1867	6	25	F	5	Feb. 17	Mar. 6	— 21	— 26	— 30	June 9	23	— 1
1868	7	6	ED	4	— 9	Feb. 26	— 12	— 17	— 21	May 31	— 24	Nov. 29
1869	8	17	C	2	Jan. 24	— 10	Mar. 28	— 2	— 6	— 16	26	— 28
1870	9	28	B	5	Feb. 13	Mar. 2	April 17	— 22	— 26	June 5	23	— 27
1871	10	9	A	4	— 5	Feb. 22	— 9	— 14	— 18	May 28	— 25	Dec. 3
1872	11	20	GF	3	Jan. 28	— 14	Mar. 31	— 5	— 9	— 19	26	— 1
1873	12	1	E	4	Feb. 9	— 26	April 13	— 18	— 22	June 1	24	Nov. 30
1874	13	12	D	3	— 1	— 18	— 5	— 10	— 14	May 24	— 25	— 29
1875	14	23	C	2	Jan. 24	— 10	Mar. 28	— 2	— 6	— 16	26	— 28
1876	15	4	BA	5	Feb. 13	Mar. 1	April 16	— 21	— 25	June 4	24	Dec. 3
1877	16	15	G	5	Jan. 28	Feb. 14	— 1	— 6	— 10	May 20	— 26	— 2
1878	17	26	F	5	Feb. 17	Mar. 6	— 21	— 26	— 30	June 9	23	— 1
1879	18	7	E	4	— 9	Feb. 26	— 13	— 18	— 22	— 31	24	Nov. 30
1880	19	18	DC	4	Jan. 25	— 11	Mar. 28	— 2	— 6	May 16	— 26	— 28
1881	1	0	B	5	Feb. 13	Mar. 2	April 17	— 22	— 26	June 5	23	— 27
1882	2	11	A	4	— 5	Feb. 22	— 9	— 14	— 18	May 28	— 25	Dec. 3
1883	3	22	G	2	Jan. 21	— 7	Mar. 25	April 29	— 3	— 13	27	— 2
1884	4	3	FE	4	Feb. 10	— 27	April 13	May 18	— 22	June 1	24	Nov. 30
1885	5	14	C	3	— 1	— 18	— 5	— 10	— 14	May 24	— 25	— 29
1886	6	25	D	6	— 21	Mar. 10	— 25	— 30	June 3	June 13	23	— 28
1887	7	6	B	4	— 6	Feb. 23	— 10	— 15	May 19	May 29	— 24	— 27
1888	8	17	AG	3	Jan. 29	— 15	— 1	— 6	— 10	— 20	26	Dec. 2
1889	9	28	F	5	Feb. 17	Mar. 6	— 21	— 26	— 30	June 9	23	— 1

'*The Epact*.'—This is the only place in the Prayer Book where this word occurs, nor is it *necessarily* connected with the finding of Easter, and it occurs here without any explanation, though there is no word which requires it more. This explanation, however, cannot be given in a few words.

Putting it shortly, the epact (from ἐπαύω, *intercalo*) for any year (for each year has one assigned to it) is a number (like the golden number, one in a cycle of 19 years) designed to show, and which does show, the age of the moon on the first day of January in that year, and thence its age on any other day of that year. How does it show it? Thus: the lunar month (or time from one new moon to another) is rather more than $29\frac{1}{2}$ days. (In order to omit fractions, the lunar month is taken as consisting alternately of 30 and 29 days.) The ordinary lunar year, therefore, is 354 days, or less by 11 days than an ordinary solar year. In order, then, to make the lunar cycle of 19 years equal to 19 solar years, 209 days (or 11×19) must be added to the former. This will bring both periods to consist of 6,935 days. Add to these $4\frac{3}{4}$ days (which occur equally in the solar and lunar periods of 19 years)—viz. 4 days for the 4 completed leap years, and $\frac{3}{4}$ of a day for the uncompleted one, which occur in 19 years—and you have each period to consist of 6,939 $\frac{3}{4}$ days. The 209 days are intercalated in 6 months of 30 days (=180) inserted in the course of, and 1 month of 29 days inserted at the end of, the period of 19 years. Now, if the age of the moon be 0 days (*i.e.* if it be new) on January 1 in the first year of the lunar cycle, the epact for that year will be 0, and on January 1 of the next or second year of the cycle her age will be 11 days, and 11 will be the epact; and on the same day of the third year her age will be 22 days, and the epact will be 22. In the fourth year it will be 33 days, and the epact will be 33. But, instead of writing down 33, the unit figure (3) is alone considered, and deemed the epact of the year, the 30 being regarded as an additional lunar month of 30 days, and really added in accordingly, although ostensibly disregarded; and so throughout the cycle of 19 years, whenever the moon's age exceeds that figure, which it does (as will be seen by studying the epact column in the subjoined 'Table of Epacts'), 6 times in the cycle. In the last year of that cycle the epact, according to the new style, is 18, and in the year following would be, by parity of reasoning, 29; but the 29 may be, and is, disregarded and deducted in the numeration, and 0 substituted for it in the table (one month of 29 days only being, as we have seen, due for intercalation at the end of the 19 years), just as, and for the same reason as, the thirties had been,

although it is really added in the *computation*; and thus the cycle of the epact numbers, according to the new style, recommences again with 0 next after 18, as the lunar cycle does with 1 after 19. Of course the suppression of six thirties and one 29 in the cycle is only for the purpose of abbreviated expression and simplicity in the enumeration. Eleven might have been expressly added, and so expressed, every year; but the result would come out the same—209 intercalated days in 19 years. That is the indispensable thing, and the secret of the epact cycle. The last epact of the *old* style being 29 (the exact number required for it), the table recommences with 11.

In the words of Dr. Butcher,¹ 'in the new Gregorian Paschal table the golden numbers were replaced by another set of numbers, called "epacts," which were connected with the golden numbers by certain relations. The Sunday letters also underwent a change. So that the *data* for determining Easter Day were the epact and the Gregorian Sunday letter of the year. When the Gregorian reformation was adopted in England, similar tables were drawn by the then Astronomer Royal, Dr. Bradley, the chief difference between them and the Gregorian tables being that in them the golden numbers were retained, in the Gregorian the epacts were employed.'

The above explanation will be more clearly comprehended by the annexed table, in which it will be observed that the

TABLE OF EPACTS

Golden Number	Old Style	New Style
1	11	0
2	22	11
3	3	22
4	14	3
5	25	14
6	6	25
7	17	6
8	28	17
9	9	28
10	20	9
11	1	20
12	12	1
13	23	12
14	4	23
15	15	4
16	26	15
17	7	26
18	18	7
19	29	18

third column represents the epacts as invented by Lilius, the famous Neapolitan astronomer, or rather Clavius, who carried out the Gregorian calendar, A.D. 1582 (when, doubtless, the moon's age was 0 on January 1, in the first year of the lunar cycle); whilst the second column shows the state of the epacts as invented by Meton, anterior to the time of Lilius, when the moon was doubtless eleven days old on January 1 in the first year of the cycle. Lilius's table holds good (*i.e.* exhibits the epacts correctly) till A.D. 1900, after which it will require correction in the way and for the reasons presently stated, and the epact till then [can be found by the formula

$$e = \left(\frac{11(g-1)}{30} \right)_r$$

¹ *General Proof of Gauss' Rule*, p. 1.

where a represents the epact, g the golden number, r the remainder from the division. For, as the epact is an addition of 11 days to *each* year of the lunar cycle, we must add it to itself as many times as are expressed by the golden number, or place of the solar year in that cycle (which is equivalent to multiplying it by that number), always taking care first to deduct one, or once the golden number, because in Lilius's table 11 was not to be added in the first year, in consequence of its beginning in a year when the moon's age was 0 on January 1; and the product is divided by 30 because the thirties are rejected, as we have seen, from the calculation. The remainder (r), if not 29, is the epact required. If it be 29, the epact is 0, because the last intercalary month of the epact cycle being required to consist of 29 days only, a remainder of 29 is *equivalent* to a remainder of 30, in which case the division would have gone again, and the remainder would have been 0. Thus, applying the above formula to the year 1874 A.D., the epact will be 12.

We find no Parliamentary authority for the above-mentioned 'Table of Moveable Feasts for Fifty-two Years.' The Act of 1751 contained such a table for the fifty-two years from 1752 to 1804, but that having long since expired, and neither that nor any subsequent Act having authorised the introduction of other tables for fifty-two years, it would seem questionable whether such tables (which each edition of the Prayer Book gives differently) are of any legal validity.

A TABLE OF THE MOVEABLE FEASTS,
According to the several Days that Easter can possibly fall upon.

Easter Day	Sundays after Epiphany	Septuagesima Sunday	The First Day of Lent	Rogation Sunday	Ascension Day	Whit Sunday	Sundays after Trinity	Advent Sunday
Mar. 22	1	Jan. 18	Feb. 4	April 26	April 30	May 10	27	Nov. 29
— 23	1	— 19	— 5	— 27	May 1	— 11	— 30	— 30
— 24	1	— 20	— 6	— 28	— 2	— 12	27	Dec. 1
— 25	2	— 21	— 7	— 29	— 3	— 13	27	— 2
— 26	2	— 22	— 8	— 30	— 4	— 14	27	— 3
— 27	2	— 23	— 9	May 1	— 5	— 15	26	Nov. 27
— 28	2	— 24	— 10	— 2	— 6	— 16	26	— 28
— 29	2	— 25	— 11	— 3	— 7	— 17	26	— 29
— 30	2	— 26	— 12	— 4	— 8	— 18	26	— 30
— 31	2	— 27	— 13	— 5	— 9	— 19	26	Dec. 1
April 1	3	— 28	— 14	— 6	— 10	— 20	26	— 2
— 2	3	— 29	— 15	— 7	— 11	— 21	26	— 3
— 3	3	— 30	— 16	— 8	— 12	— 22	25	Nov. 27
— 4	3	— 31	— 17	— 9	— 13	— 23	25	— 28
— 5	3	Feb. 1	— 18	— 10	— 14	— 24	25	— 29
— 6	3	— 2	— 19	— 11	— 15	— 25	25	— 30
— 7	3	— 3	— 20	— 12	— 16	— 26	25	Dec. 1
— 8	4	— 4	— 21	— 13	— 17	— 27	25	— 2
— 9	4	— 5	— 22	— 14	— 18	— 28	25	— 3
— 10	4	— 6	— 23	— 15	— 19	— 29	24	Nov. 27
— 11	4	— 7	— 24	— 16	— 20	— 30	24	— 28
— 12	4	— 8	— 25	— 17	— 21	— 31	24	— 29
— 13	4	— 9	— 26	— 18	— 22	June 1	24	— 30
— 14	4	— 10	— 27	— 19	— 23	— 2	24	Dec. 1
— 15	5	— 11	— 28	— 20	— 24	— 3	24	— 2
— 16	5	— 12	Mar. 1	— 21	— 25	— 4	24	— 3
— 17	5	— 13	— 2	— 22	— 26	— 5	23	Nov. 27
— 18	5	— 14	— 3	— 23	— 27	— 6	23	— 28
— 19	5	— 15	— 4	— 24	— 28	— 7	23	— 29
— 20	5	— 16	— 5	— 25	— 29	— 8	23	— 30
— 21	5	— 17	— 6	— 26	— 30	— 9	23	Dec. 1
— 22	6	— 18	— 7	— 27	— 31	— 10	23	— 2
— 23	6	— 19	— 8	— 28	June 1	— 11	23	— 3
— 24	6	— 20	— 9	— 29	— 2	— 12	22	Nov. 27
— 25	6	— 21	— 10	— 30	— 3	— 13	22	— 28

Note, that in a Bissextile or Leap Year the number of Sundays after Epiphany will be the same as if Easter Day had fallen one day later than it really does. And for the same reason, one day must, in every Leap Year, be added to the day of the month given by the table for Septuagesima Sunday; and the like must be done for the first day of Lent (commonly called Ash Wednesday), unless the table gives some day in the month of March for it; for in that case the day given by the table is the right day.

A TABLE TO FIND EASTER,
From the Year 1900 to the Year 2199 inclusive.

Golden Numbers	Days of the Month	Sunday Letters	
XIV.	March 22	D	<p>The Golden Numbers in the foregoing Calendar will point out the days of the Paschal Full Moons, till the year of our Lord 1900; at which time, in order that the ecclesiastical Full Moons may fall nearly on the same days with the real Full Moons, the Golden Numbers must be removed to different days of the Calendar, as is done in the annexed table, which contains so much of the Calendar then to be used, as is necessary for finding the Paschal Full Moons, and the Feast of Easter, from the year 1900 to the year 2199 inclusive. This table is to be made use of, in all respects, as the first table before inserted, for finding Easter till the year 1899.</p>
III.	— 23	E	
	— 24	F	
XI.	— 25	G	
	— 26	A	
XIX.	— 27	B	
VIII.	— 28	C	
	— 29	D	
XVI.	— 30	E	
V.	— 31	F	
	April 1	G	
XIII.	— 2	A	
II.	— 3	B	
	— 4	C	
X.	— 5	D	
	— 6	E	
XVIII.	— 7	F	
VII.	— 8	G	
	— 9	A	
XV.	— 10	B	
IV.	— 11	C	
	— 12	D	
XII.	— 13	E	
I.	— 14	F	
	— 15	G	
IX.	— 16	A	
XVII.	— 17	B	
VI.	— 18	C	
	— 19	D	
	— 20	E	
	— 21	F	
	— 22	G	
	— 23	A	
	— 24	B	
	— 25	C	

The first table requires no explanation. As to the second, in consequence of the lunar error (explained above),¹ one day has to be added every 300 years (about); in other words, the golden number, indicating what year of the cycle we are in, requires to be moved forward one day in the calendar in that period of 300 years; *e.g.* the golden number (XIV.) which now stands against March 21, will stand against March 22 (and so of the other golden numbers). But in 2100 no further movement of the golden number is needed, because

¹ See *supra*.

in it there will be the *loss* of one day for the solar,¹ and the *addition* of one for the lunar, error, which compensate each other; and in 2000 neither error occurs, so that the table lasts good for 300 years, the numbers remaining against the same days of the month as before. The table is to be *used* like the 'Table to find Easter till 1899,'² here called the 'first table before inserted.'

GENERAL TABLES

For finding the Dominical or Sunday Letter and the Places of the Golden Numbers in the Calendar.

TABLE I.						
6	5	4	3	2	1	0
B	C	D	E	F	G	A
				1600	1700	1800
1900 2000	2100	2200	2300 2400	2500	2600	2700 2800
2900	3000	3100 3200	3300	3400	3500 3600	3700
3800	3900 4000	4100	4200	4300 4400	4500	4600
4700 4800	4900	5000	5100 5200	5300	5400	5500 5600
5700	5800	5900 6000	6100	6200	6300 6400	6500
6600	6700 6800	6900	7000	7100 7200	7300	7400
7500 7600	7700	7800	7900 8000	8100	8200	8300 8400
8500	&c.					

To find the Dominical or Sunday Letter for any given year of our Lord, add to the year its fourth part, omitting fractions, and also the number which in Table I. standeth at the top of the column, wherein the number of hundreds contained in that given year is found: divide the sum by 7, and if there is no remainder, then A is the Sunday Letter; but if any number remaineth, then the letter which standeth under the number at the top of the table is the Sunday Letter.

¹ See *post*.² See *supra*.

TABLE II.

1	2	3	1	2	3
	Years of our Lord			Years of our Lord	
B	1600	0	B	5200	15
	1700	1		5300	16
	1800	1		5400	17
	1900	2		5500	17
B	2000	2	B	5600	17
	2100	2		5700	18
	2200	3		5800	18
	2300	4		5900	19
B	2400	3	B	6000	19
	2500	4		6100	19
	2600	5		6200	20
	2700	5		6300	21
B	2800	5	B	6400	20
	2900	6		6500	21
	3000	6		6600	22
	3100	7		6700	23
B	3200	7	B	6800	22
	3300	7		6900	23
	3400	8		7000	24
	3500	9		7100	24
B	3600	8	B	7200	24
	3700	9		7300	25
	3800	10		7400	25
	3900	10		7500	26
B	4000	10	B	7600	26
	4100	11		7700	26
	4200	12		7800	27
	4300	12		7900	28
B	4400	12	B	8000	27
	4500	13		8100	28
	4600	13		8200	29
	4700	14		8300	29
B	4800	14	B	8400	29
	4900	14		8500	0
	5000	15		&c.	
	5100	16			

To find the month and days of the month to which the Golden Numbers ought to be prefixed in the Calendar, in any given year of our Lord, consisting of entire hundred years, and in all the intermediate years betwixt that and the next hundredth year following, look in the second column of Table II. for the given year consisting of entire hundreds, and note the number or cypher which stands against it in the third column; then, in Table III. look for the same number in the column under any given Golden Number, which when you have found, guide your eye sideways to the left hand, and in the first column you will find the month and day to which that Golden Number ought to be prefixed in the Calendar, during that period of one hundred years.

The letter B prefixed to certain hundredth years in Table II. denotes those years which are still to be accounted Bissextile or Leap Years in the new Calendar; whereas all the other hundredth years are to be accounted only common years.

TABLE III.

Paschal Full Moon	Sunday Letter	THE GOLDEN NUMBERS																		
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
Mar. 21	C	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23	4	15	26
— 22	D	9	20	1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27
— 23	E	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28
— 24	F	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	29
— 25	G	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	0
Mar. 26	A	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1
— 27	B	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	10	21	2
— 28	C	15	26	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3
— 29	D	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23	4
— 30	E	17	28	9	20	1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	5
Mar. 31	F	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6
April 1	G	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23	4	15	26	7
— 2	A	20	1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8
— 3	B	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9
— 4	C	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	10
April 5	D	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	0	11
— 6	E	24	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12
— 7	F	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	10	21	2	13
— 8	G	26	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14
— 9	A	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23	4	15
April 10	B	28	9	20	1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	5	16
— 11	C	29	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17
— 12	D	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18
— 13	E	1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19
— 14	F	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20
April 15	G	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	10	21
— 16	A	4	15	26	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22
— 17	B	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23
— 17	B	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23
— 18	C	6	17	28	9	20	1	12	23	4	15	26	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24
April 18	C	7	18	29	10	21	2	13	24	5	16	27	8	19	0	11	22	3	14	25

Table I., it will be observed, is for finding the Sunday letters; Tables II. and III. are for finding the place of the golden numbers.

'Table I.'—Hitherto the Prayer Book has given us no rule for finding the Sunday letter further than A.D. 1899. We have one now for finding it till A.D. 8500, which is virtually for ever. Thus, applying the rule at the foot of the Table to, *e.g.*, A.D. 1974, the Sunday letter comes out F. As it is difficult, however, to carry about our Prayer Books always

with us, the Sunday letter may be found by remembering the following formula:—

$$L = 2 \left(\frac{c}{4} \right)_r + 2 \left(\frac{y}{4} \right)_r + 4 \left(\frac{y}{7} \right)_r + 1 \text{ (rejecting sevens),}$$

where L denotes the Sunday letter, c the number of completed centuries, y the year of the current century, and r the remainder of each division in the calculation; the ultimate result appearing in the following table, which is constructed on the regular progressive, and not (as the one we have already considered¹) in the backward order of the letters:—

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
A	B	C	D	E	F	G

The *letter* corresponding to the result is the Sunday letter.

And there is this further use in the Sunday letters and their column in the calendar (though not in connection with finding Easter): that, from knowing them, we can learn the week-days, on which any past event has happened of which we know the date. Applying the above formula to, e.g., 1942 A.D., we find the Sunday letter to be D; for—

$$\left(\frac{19}{4} \right)_r = 3 \text{ and } \left(\frac{42}{4} \right)_r = 2 \text{ and } \left(\frac{42}{7} \right)_r = 0;$$

$$2 \times 3 = 6 \quad 2 \times 2 = 4 \quad 4 \times 0 = 0;$$

$$\therefore 6 + 4 + 1 = 11,$$

$$\text{which (rejecting sevens) = 4,}$$

$$\text{which by the table = D.}$$

'*Tables II. and III.*'—Hitherto the Prayer Book had given us only rules for finding the places of the golden numbers from 1900 to 2199. We can from these tables find them generally (*i.e.* till 8500, which is practically for ever).

'*Then, in Table III. look for the same number in the column under any given Golden Number.*'—That is, the place of that golden number can be found by tracing the single number which you have taken in Table II., column 3, to its place under that golden number in Table III. Thus, if we want to know the place of golden number 14 in 1900, see what day of the month in column 1 of Table III. stands to the left of that number 2 *which occurs in that column of Table III. which is headed by 14*, and you will find it March 22.

'*The Letter B is prefixed,*' &c.—To guard against the recurrence for the future of the solar error, which had been set right in 1582, and, as we have said, amounts to 3 days in 400

¹ See *supra*.

years, 3 days were ordered by Pope Gregory to be suppressed in every future 400 years, or (which is the same thing) those centenary years only are made bissextile or leap years the number of whose *centuries* is a multiple of 4; whereas, but for this order, *every centenary year* would have been reckoned a leap year, because it is always a multiple of 4—*e.g.* under the new rule (or style) 1700, 1800, and 1900 are ordinary years, 2000 is a leap year.

Correction of the Epact.

So little is said in the Prayer Book about the epact, it may seem unnecessary to follow it out to its *correction*, which, however, is as necessary as that of the place of the golden number itself; for, like it, being a lunar cycle, it is liable to the 'lunar error' before described, and being also accommodated to days of the solar year (*i.e.* representing the age of the moon on a day of the solar year), is liable also to the 'solar error.' It will now be evident, from what has been said, that those centenary years in which the epact has required, or will require, correction for solar error are (beginning from 1582) 1700, 1800, 1900, 2100, 2200, 2300, 2500, 2600, 2700, 2900, 3000, 3100, and so on—in other words, every centenary year that is not made bissextile—and that this error requires the *subtraction* of 1 (*i.e.* one day) every such hundredth year from the ordinary epact number.

It is also clear, from what has been said of the lunar error, that the centenary years which have required, or will require, correction on this account, counting from A.D. 1800, which Clavius, the real author, of the Gregorian calendar, advised Gregory to take as the period of 25 centuries above referred to,¹ are 2100, 2400, 2700, 3000, 3300, 3600, 3900, and so on; and that the correction of this error requires the *addition* of unity (that is, one day) seven times successively at the end of every 300, and once at the end of 400, years. When both errors concur, as in 2100, they neutralise each other, and no correction is needed; so also where neither error occurs, as in A.D. 2000. The lunar error thus requiring an addition, and the solar error a subtraction, the difference of the two will give the required correction. The formula for the former—*i.e.* the increase up to A.D. 4200—where Clavius stopped, as another day will not be lost till then—is $\left(\frac{c-17}{3}\right)_w - 5$, where *c* equals the completed centuries, 17 the century up to which all was set right,²

¹ See *supra*.

² Woolhouse on *Measures of Time*, p. 153.

ω the integers, or whole numbers, which only are to be taken. This makes, therefore, $\left(\frac{c}{3}\right)\omega - 5$. The formula for the decrease or subtraction on account of the solar error from 1700 to 4200 is

$$c - 17 - \left(\frac{c-17}{4}\right)\omega = c - \left(\frac{c}{4}\right)\omega - 17 + 4 = c - \left(\frac{c}{4}\right)\omega - 13.$$

This makes the *difference* between the two errors

$$\left(\frac{c}{3}\right)\omega - 5 - \left[c - \left(\frac{c}{4}\right)\omega - 13\right] = 8 + \left(\frac{c}{3}\right)\omega + \left(\frac{c}{4}\right)\omega - c.$$

To apply the above formulæ to, *e.g.*, A.D. 1942, what will be the corrected epact for that year?

$$\text{Here } y = 1942$$

$$\text{and } c = 19$$

$$\text{and } \text{GN} = \frac{y+1}{19} = 5.$$

$$\text{And the ordinary new style epact} = 11 \left(\frac{5-1}{30}\right)_r = 14.$$

$$\therefore \text{the corrected epact} = 14 + 8 + \left(\frac{c}{3}\right)\omega + \left(\frac{c}{4}\right)\omega - c,$$

$$= 14 + 8 + 6 + 4 - 19,$$

$$= 13 \text{ (or a subtraction of unity from the ordinary epact).}$$

George, the second Earl of Macclesfield, son of the Lord Chancellor, in a paper read by him in 1750 at the Royal Society, of which he became President in 1752, puts the correction in his usual perspicuous and felicitous way:¹—

‘It is plain that the lunar year will have lost one day more than ordinary’ [*i.e.* will have lost twelve days in all] ‘whenever the new moon shall have anticipated’ [*i.e.* fallen earlier by] ‘a whole day, as it will have done at those times’ [*i.e.* every 310·7 years] ‘when it is necessary that the golden numbers should be set back one day; and consequently the epact’ . . . ‘which is the difference in whole days between the common Julian solar and the lunar year’² . . . ‘for that and the succeeding years must exceed by an unit the several corresponding epacts of the preceding 19 years.’ ‘The augmenting of the epact is the same thing as setting back the golden number.’

And again, speaking generally of the comparative use of the epacts, and golden numbers under the Julian account—

‘If, instead of the golden numbers, the epacts of the several years were prefixed in the manner the Gregorians have done to the

¹ *Philosophical Transactions for 1750*, vol. xlv. p. 121.

² *Ibid.*

days of the calendar, in order to denote the days on which the new moons fall in those years whereof those numbers are the epacts, there would never be occasion to shift the places of those epacts in the calendar, since the augmentation, by an unit extraordinary, of those epacts would answer the purpose, and keep all tolerably right. But the regulating these things for those who use the Gregorian account is an affair of more intricacy.¹

And again—

‘The Gregorians order the epacts to have an additional augmentation of an unit 8 times in 2,500 years, beginning with 1800, as at the end of 400 years; to which 400 years, if there be added 3 times 700, or 2100 years, the period of 2500 will be completed in 3900; after which they do not make this extraordinary augmentation of an unit in the epacts till at the end of another 400 years, which defers that augmentation from 4200 to 4300.’²

The above formulæ having given the *quantum* of correction, the following rule will show the student of ecclesiastical chronology (who will now understand the reason of it) *when* it is required:—

1. Years whose entire hundreds are exactly divisible by 3 (and therefore liable to correction for lunar error), but not by 4 (and therefore not liable to correction for solar error).

The Gregorian solar and the lunar year both lose one day.

2. Years whose entire hundreds are exactly divisible by 4, but not by three.

Neither the Gregorian solar nor the lunar year loses.

3. Years, whose entire hundreds are exactly divisible by both 4 and 3.

The Gregorian solar year goes on as usual.
The lunar year loses.

4. Years whose entire hundreds are exactly divisible by neither 3 nor 4.

The Gregorian solar year loses.
The lunar year goes on as usual.

The epact is neither diminished nor augmented, and the golden numbers are not shifted.

The epact is augmented, and the golden number set back, one day.

The epact is diminished, and the golden number set forward, one day.

And, inasmuch as the year is more often not divided by 4 than it is divided by 3, the epacts are more often diminished than increased.

Those who wish to follow out yet further the solution of the

¹ *Philosophical Transactions for 1750*, vol. xlv. p. 425.

² *Ibid.*

Easter problem, and to calculate Easter without the necessity of employing either the golden numbers or the epacts, but from the sole *datum* of the number of the given year A.D., would do well to refer to the elaborate essay by the late Dr. Butcher at the head of our paper. The object of the Bishop is to connect the rule of the famous German mathematician Gauss with that of the equally famous French astronomer Delambre, and to show how that of the former follows from that of the latter—first considering the case of Easter in the Gregorian calculation, and then applying it to ‘the particular and more simple case of Easter in the Julian calculation.’

ART. VI.—CONTINENTAL CULTURE.

1. *German Home Life.* (Longmans.)
2. *French Home Life.* (Blackwood.)
3. *Kindergärten: a Visit to German Schools.* By JOSEPH PAYNE. (Henry S. King.)
4. *A French Eton.* By the Rev. S. HAWTREY. (Hickesly.)
5. *Round my House.* By P. G. HAMERTON. (Seeley.)

MANY of our readers have no doubt become acquainted with Principal Shairp's *Five Lectures on Culture and Religion*, in which his great point is the failure of culture to raise or refine, except as the child of religion.

‘Culture, though made our end never so earnestly, cannot shelter a man from thoughts about himself, cannot free him from that which all must feel to be fatal to high character—continual self-consciousness. The only forces strong enough to do this are great truths which carry him out of and beyond himself—the things of the spiritual world, sought not mainly because of their reflex action on us, but for their own sakes, because of their own inherent worthiness. There is, perhaps, no truer sign that a man is really advancing than that he is learning to forget himself, that he is losing the natural thoughts about self in the thought of One higher than himself, to whose guidance he can commit himself and all men. This is no doubt a lesson not quickly learnt; but there is no help to learning it in theories of self-culture which exalt man's natural self-seeking into a specious and refined philosophy of life.’—*Shairp*, Lecture iii.

In other words, culture, unless subservient to religion, is mere exaggeration of selfishness in one form or another. It

leads either to isolated self-contemplation or to outward self-seeking, only so far respecting the rights of others as to avoid provoking them into returning evil for evil, thus achieving social law. Now the experiment which seems to be universal in the modern world, from the Ganges to the Mississippi, is that of putting culture foremost, religion as the mere accessory. We all know the stock argument—'Sects cannot agree on a religious education. Therefore let the State enforce secular culture; and as to religion, *chacun à son goût*. A non-religious education is not irreligious.'

Therewith we are bidden to admire and follow the example of our neighbours. There are lands where the religion of culture has had full scope, and has educated the generation now acting and thinking. In France the Minister of Education can tell what every class in every school is doing at any given hour; and as nobody can get employment, enter any public office, or teach, without due diplomas, it is not possible to escape the regulation system. In like manner, in Germany, no one, from the prince to the ploughboy, can elude culture duly proportioned to his station in life. The *Kindergarten* fosters the infant's power of observation, definition, and drill; the Primary School impresses a thorough analytical knowledge of the mother tongue, the *Real School* educates the tradesman, the Classical School the scholar and the gentleman; the University crowns all, and there are throughout such discipline and thoroughness as render a German teacher one of the best of instructors.

In France, during the reign of the Citizen King, religion was entirely eliminated from all public instruction for the nobler sex, and was confined to seminaries for the priesthood. As we all know, it was the struggle of Montalembert's life to obtain the freedom of giving religious instruction in schools for laymen. He succeeded after the Revolution of 1848, but without achieving popularity for education based on religion; and though the religious orders, such as the Jesuits and the Frères Chrétiens, are not prohibited from teaching, the greater number of lads never come under their hands, and their tenure is insecure, although the pupils of the former are said to be eminently successful in competitions. As things stand at present in France, most boys of the upper classes are educated in Government lyceums, entirely in secular hands, and in the villages there is a schoolmaster, also entirely secular, and usually a hostile authority to the parish priest. The greater number of young ladies, on the other hand, if not brought up at home, go to the convents of the religious orders devoted

to education, and in most towns and many villages there are girls' schools kept by Sisters of Charity, some as sewing schools, others as *salles d'asile* or infant schools, but always giving some religious instruction.

In Germany 'the religious difficulty' has been so successfully manipulated that, though something called religion is taught, and furnishes the subject of hymns, Bible stories, and the like, it is so undogmatic that nobody heeds or cares about it, and it becomes a sweet, childlike inward sentiment, finding its chief expression in the Christmas tree, which is all the more delightful from its connection with the ash Yggdrasil.¹

There has now been full time for generations to grow up and show the working of the culture system, and its effects both with regard to manliness and refinement. Perhaps, however, it is fair to observe that it is difficult and invidious for the native of one country to judge of the refinement of a foreigner, since different standards naturally prevail, so that mere decorum in one country seems affectation in another, and coarseness in the ears of one nation is but simplicity to its neighbour. We call a man brutal when he beats his wife or kicks his fallen foe; the French call him brutal if he speaks an abrupt truth, does not say 'monsieur' or 'madame' every fourth word, or comes into a shop with his hat on; and the Germans think it an insult not to declare on your envelope that your correspondent is well born, nobly born, and all the rest of it.

Still there *is* an ideal standard of refinement. It is the outcome of the realisation of the truth that we are *all* children of God, members of Christ, and temples of the Holy Ghost. This knowledge gives courtesy, modesty, and self-respecting dignity, telling as much against clownishness as against grossness and conceit. If monks of old revelled in uncleanness and vermin it was not because they were Christians, but because they were not Christians enough. Such good breeding as comes of the Law of Love is to be found among all ranks, though the outward show of it is generally attained almost as an inheritance by the higher classes in all countries, and it ought to be the object of culture to render it universal. Indeed, it becomes almost the test of the reality of culture, and, on the other hand, as soon as manliness becomes impaired by cultivation it becomes evident that there is some error in the treatment.

We are here dealing with the two nations whose proverbial

¹ See 'Cradle Songs,' *Macmillan's Magazine*.

character places the first at the head of Dame Europa's school for manners, the other—shall we say, at the bottom of the class? We think we must rank it there, when we remember Erasmus's description of a German inn, and recollect Freytag's sketches. Owing to her numerous petty divisions and fierce intermittent wars, Germany fell far behind other nations in the progress of civilisation and morality in the Middle Ages, and, in spite of the vast strides that intellect has made, the mass of her people do not seem to have been drawn out of roughness and boorishness. Thus the material has to be taken into consideration when considering the effects of training.

We borrow some descriptions of the German plans of training from Mr. Joseph Payne's *Visit to German Schools* :—

'I visited in Hamburg some of the *Bürger-Kindergärten*, of which there are, I believe, nine in different parts of the town. In one of them I found several children, a division of whom were busily employed in constructing various forms and building with the little cubes of the fifth *Gift*. The fifth *Gift* presents a cube as divided into twenty-seven smaller cubes, and these are divided diagonally into fifty-four half-cubes or prisms. Thus considered, it affords opportunity for forming (1) life objects, (2) beauty objects, (3) knowledge objects.'—Payne, p. 26.

The 'life object' in the woodcut bears a distant resemblance to a house; the beauty object is a sort of ornamental cross within a square; the knowledge objects seem to be squares. Another *Gift* is what is called *Flechten*, and consists of weaving strips of paper, whether white or coloured, into objects of life and beauty in a sort of matting such as some of us remember old ladies trying to persuade restless children to make for book-markers.

Again, at Berlin Mr. Payne found the children from three to seven going through instructive games, some of which have, we think, been imported to our infant schools. Here is one :—

The Sportsman.—The children forming a large ring with joined hands, and singing a song adapted to the subject, one of them is detached to represent a midge disporting itself in the sunshine. He runs round the circle, throwing his arms about to imitate flying. Another child is then detached to represent a sparrow, who attacks the midge and swallows it up (a large demand on the imagination certainly). The midge vanishes, and the sparrow remains. A hawk (another child) immediately pounces on the sparrow and despatches him, but not with impunity, for a sportsman, who has been on the watch for the hawk, shoots him, and he falls to the ground, to the great delight of the children, who thereupon utter an animated shout.'—P. 47.

To make this lesson completely illustrative of the 'good old plan,' for the sportsman should have been substituted the Prussian eagle. But perhaps he had a needle gun.

The children also learn *Netzzeichnen*—that is, drawing straight lines on a paper ruled in squares, like uncoloured patterns for ladies' cross-stitch. They learn counting, beating time, manual exercises, and singing—the latter, strange to say, not at all well—sometimes reading and writing; but these were not intended by Fröbel, the inventor of the system. One great point on which he insisted—the employing the human blossoms in the cultivation of the vegetable blossoms, and making them work in the garden—seems to be almost wholly neglected, and is probably impracticable, for very few *Kindergärten* had gardens attached to them, and these were neglected. Ventilation—to English nostrils at least—seems not to be understood, and one large infant school at Hamburg was actually kept in a room used in the evening by a gymnastic club, and still full of the fumes of tobacco.

In Weimar Mr. Payne witnessed the religious teaching.

'The business of the morning began at eight o'clock with a short prayer, all standing. The lesson was on the history of Moses, a portion of which the teacher related in a simple manner. He then asked a number of questions, which the children answered readily. They appeared to be much interested. The good answers were repeated simultaneously by the whole class, some of the little boys nodding their heads and swaying their bodies while they answered, as if naturally moved by the interest of the story. This little trait struck me forcibly. Now and then they were required to repeat after the teacher some little rhymes. At another time the teacher said, "When we feel ourselves fresh and well in the morning, what ought we to do?" "We ought to pray and give thanks to the dear God." On the whole this was an interesting little lesson.'—P. 81.

The *Kindergärten* are not universal, and the teachers of the schools which receive the children from them at six or seven years of age complained that the little ones came up from them bringing with them 'the play spirit,' of which it was hard to cure them, and that there was so much routine and drill as to take away all their originality. The schoolmaster who made this observation did not, however, permit any play even in the intervals between the lessons, when the children went into the open air, saying that 'it disorganised them.'

To the primary schools everybody goes between seven and thirteen, under heavy penalties. The reading, writing, and arithmetic appear, by Mr. Payne's judgment, to be

thoroughly well and intelligently taught. No teacher used a book when hearing reading. If he could not understand the children, their reading was not up to the mark. At Dresden he saw the writing lesson given, the class making all the motions for each letter in the air with a dry pen simultaneously, and by word of command, before they put pen to paper. The lessons in geography, botany, and natural history, and what are in England called 'object lessons,' are also most excellent. History (?) was taught at Gotha to the children of eight years old by a teacher who narrated to them the stories of Ulysses and of Orpheus and Eurydice, observing that 'the history of the Fatherland is too difficult.'

Everybody, then, comes out of these schools able to read, spell, and write; but, after all the lessons in forms of life and beauty, here is the description of the common run of girls who present themselves for service—never, be it observed, till their course of school education is completed:—

'They are turned out [from school] hopelessly uncouth; coarse in manner, and unhandy at their work; often incorrigibly dirty, without aptitude or willingness to learn; doggedly satisfied with themselves, and convinced that the right thing to do is to treat any attempt on your part to ameliorate their manners or improve their condition with a loutish ridicule. "While I have seen," says a writer in the *Contemporary Review*, pointing out the difference between mere book-learning and education, "while I have seen perfect manners of their kind in the peasants of more than one country, Eastern and Western, I think the worst-mannered people in Europe—perhaps in the world—are the highly-taught Prussians."—*German Home Life*, p. 3.

Something, no doubt, was here due to national resistance to English ways, but we have seen the same account of the unconquerable boorishness and incapacity of German servants complained of by an English resident at Erfurt, who laboured in vain to impress on them what we should regard as the ordinary proprieties of life. German household stories which aim at nature likewise put the servant and the peasant in an unpleasant light. Auerbach especially shows the latter as surly, disobliging, set against improvement, and doing wilful mischief. Nor is it only English travellers who complain of the rough treatment they receive from railway officials. We have known a young German lady speak of such discomforts in travelling in Germany, and say how different it is as soon as she passed the Belgian frontier, and in England.

Surely this is not a pleasing outcome of some nine years or so spent in diligent culture of the intellect. And we

are afraid there is a much deeper and more terrible accusation to bring against the lower classes in Germany, and that of female servants especially, though it is in great part the fault of the cruel and short-sighted marriage laws.¹

'Marriage amongst the lower orders in Germany is cumbered about with so many restrictions and conditions that it has come to be looked on as almost an impossibility. I remember once hearing a lively discussion on this very subject in a northern duchy, where emigration, cholera, and the impossibility of marriage among the labouring classes had more than decimated the population. The harvest lay that year rotting in the fields, and there was no hand to reap and gather in the golden grain. The neglected peasant offspring cannot bring the same fibre to his work as though care and comfort had been his, and it certainly seems a false political economy which restrains marriage lest pauper families should multiply, and yet cannot prevent the emigration of thousands of tillers of the soil with their illegitimate offspring.'—*German Home Life*, p. 17.

The consequence is that the German households do not lay claim to what the most careless Englishwoman would require—in appearance, at least—respectability in their women servants. In England there may sometimes be shams; wedding rings are assumed occasionally with the connivance of the lady of the house; but the very deceit shows a different state of things from that in which the *Amme*—a far more common institution in Germany than here—seldom is even supposed to be married. Those who have ever tried to find a safe service for a penitent in England can hardly believe in such sentences as these:—

'I never got anyone to be in the least surprised, sympathetic, indignant, hurt, or otherwise emotional on the subject. German ladies take all this—as indeed, to do them justice, they take most things—very philosophically. It was the custom—*ländlich sittlich*. That which precedent has consecrated let no man or woman cavil at. It had its conveniences. "I partly agree with what you say," a friend once replied, to whom I had been stating my grievances; but I was always particular that my *Amme* had only one *Bräutigam*.'—*German Home Life*, p. 18.

Nor does there, according to this book, appear to be any of that ordinary supervision of the ways of servants that—religion apart—English families of the better class think due to their own respectability.

'In engaging a servant you will find that she invariably bargains for her "Sunday out." She belongs to a *Kränzchen*, or club, and it

¹ We are glad to learn that of late there has been some relaxation of these laws.

will be her privilege to depart early on Sunday afternoons to the coffee garden, where the festive meeting is held. Of church-going there is in Protestant Germany no question, but of much dancing during Sunday afternoons with the *Bräutigam* of the moment there can be no evasion. This is a matter of custom and right, to which it would be useless folly to demur. Of walking out nothing much is said. At seven o'clock a servant's work is considered to be finished. It is then her privilege to take her stand in some convenient corner of the garden, or under the *porte cochère*, and there, stocking in hand, finish the day with gossip and flirtation.—(p. 8.)

On the other hand, it is fair to state that candid travellers declare that they have found, both in lodgings and families, excellent, faithful, and capable servants, useful and active, though not like English ones, being used to a much simpler style of furniture, and to far more personal help and supervision from the lady of the house. There are also good German nurses all over England, and German waiters everywhere; but a German out of his Fatherland is generally far more active and effective than one in it. The men, who in their own homes take advantage of the comfortable but hopeless system of monopoly to drone on in sluggish indifference, become models of thrift, industry, and resource when once they reach the United States and have a stimulus for free exertion.

Let us turn from German peasants and servants to the same class in France. There we find the same universal thrift, and an indifference to personal comfort or display very puzzling to English ideas. The owners of large sums of hoarded money toil as severely and live in more sordid hardship than the most hardworking cottager in England. Taking Mr. Hamerton's *Round my House* as our authority, we find that he considers the French peasant to be ignorant to the last degree, and yet very intelligent. The women are religious. As to the men, 'the real feeling of the male peasant in this part of France seems to be that religion is a sort of precaution, which may not turn out to be of any use, but which it is as well to take, according to the universally known proverb, "Si ça ne fait pas de bien, ça ne fait pas de mal." And certainly the gross superstitions which are allowed to encumber religion as presented to them are enough to revolt the more intelligent. Mr. Hamerton thinks the peasantry hard, self-interested, but in general honest, upright, and well-conducted. Their first purpose in life is to retain and transmit their modicum of the soil, their next to have a sufficient sum to buy off their sons from the conscription,

and after that to portion their daughters. Honesty is tolerable among them; morality also is fair in the villages, though at a much lower ebb in the towns, owing not only to the laxer public opinion, but to the exceeding difficulty and expense of getting together the necessary documents when one or both of the parties does not happen to be a native. That amusing paper 'How Pommier was Married,' in *Macmillan's Magazine* for August 1877, shows that, in the first place, it is needful that Government should be certified of the birth of the bride and bridegroom; also of their baptism; also—whatever their age—either of their parents' consent or 'act of death.' If the bride be an orphan, she must have the authenticated consent of her nearest surviving relation; the bridegroom must have a certificate of exemption from military service—all these to be written on stamped paper, and each requiring a fee to the notary. Very good for the revenue, no doubt, but not equally good for morality. 'Oh! mademoiselle,' says poor Pommier, 'if I had only known, I would never have begun to get married!'

And these red-tapisms, subsisting under the bureaucracy which survives under every form of government in France, are, as Lord Lytton showed us in the *Parisians*, one powerful incentive to the hatred of the poor against those above them. When these cumbrous and expensive preliminaries of marriage are dispensed with, and yet the parties are faithful to one another, they can hardly help being at war both with the State system which has well-nigh forced them into sin, and with the Church that cannot but condemn them though her State fetters hinder her from preventing the evil.

However, as we have said, most girls are bred up either by *sœurs de charité*, or at any rate in connection with or allegiance to the parish priest, and even boys as uniformly present themselves for their first Communion as in Germany for the Confirmation, which there serves as a certificate of being ready for service. The instruction in the village schools of France does not (or did not a few years ago) go very high. The letters of the poor are of the 'This comes hopping you are well' order. We have seen a specimen written by a soldier, informing 'Monsieur le Mère' of his village that he has had the misfortune 'de perdre une jambe, avec lequel je vous salue.' Their arithmetic, in spite of decimal coinage, does not go far; and as to their books, we once heard a class reading to a *sœur* an instruction on the manners of society—the handing in and out of dinner, and the rinsing of the mouth after eating; the moral being pointed by the story of a *jeune*

personne who denied that she had eaten garlic, but who was detected, and thus lost an excellent *établissement*—not by the falsehood, but by the neglect. The inclination to teach making lace and flowers for the churches, instead of plain needlework, is said to be the snare of these sisters' schools. But, whatever their deficiencies, it is worth while to turn from the chapter on servants in *German Home Life* to that on the same subject in *French Home Life*. Two things must, however, be taken into account—one, the national character; the other, the much greater good-humour and good-nature of the writer on France. Yet even he (or she) sees much that is terribly harmful in the Parisian system, which is declared to be thoroughly rotten.

'The thirty servants, male and female, of the different tenants of a large house are all perched on the sixth storey in thirty numbered rooms; each has a key, and can either receive by the *escalier de service* all the visits which he or she may wish for, or may go out to visit other sixth floors. . . . With such liberty as this it is wonderful that Paris servants should be as good as they are. There are scamps enough amongst them, but there are a great many excellent creatures too, and quantities of brave girls, who stick to their religious duties, who get up in the early morning to go to Mass, who walk to their beds down those foul corridors with their eyes straight before them and their ears resolutely closed, like little saints whom no temptation can touch.'—*French Home Life*, p. 25.

These girls have been trained in something more refining than reading and writing. And though the *femme de chambre* seems to be somewhat changeable and capricious, yet while she is in your service she has high merits; and in the country

'the general characteristics of French private servants may be said to be activity, cleanly aspect, cheery temper, simplicity, and economy. . . . Adaptability is another great merit of both men and women. They are able and willing to do each other's work. None of them would ever dream of saying, "It's not my place to do it." If there be any reason for it, a cook will clean the drawing-room, a footman will cook the dinner, a lady's-maid will black the boots, without any growling, and rather as fun than otherwise. . . . A good man-servant always knows a little of carpentry and upholstery, can mend a broken lock, can sew, can fry and stew, can bottle wine, and make beds, and dust rooms, as if he had been born for nothing else. The women—most of them, at least—can do all sorts of women's work, have some idea of doctoring and nursing and of the use of medicines, can wash and iron and wait at table. Never was the notion of being generally useful more clearly understood or more gaily practised than by the better part of the Paris servants, and by country servants almost without exception. And when your household is an old one—

when you have had the luck to get together a group who do not quarrel, when the duration of service in your house begins to count by years, when the heart has grown interested on both sides—then you find out what French servants are capable of being. Then, when sorrow comes, when sickness and death are inside your walls, then you get the measure of the devotion which quality can alone produce. Then come long nights spent together watching by feverish bedsides, in mutual anguish and with mutual care; then come tears that are shed together over the common loss, and hands that wring yours with the earnestness of true affection; and afterwards, when you are calm enough to think, you recognise that these servants are indeed your friends.'—*French Home Life*, p. 33.

Of course we are not unreasonable enough to expect everywhere French grace and versatility, but surely the folding of papers and building of cubes can be of little purpose if they leave the mind and fingers as unprepared for improvement and as awkward as ever. We do not believe that English finish and neatness in the belongings of a house are desired or attained by either nation, but the Frenchwoman's person and room are always neat, while the German servant is rough and slovenly, and goes about the house in slipshod, dirty untidiness. And in those essentials of which refinement is but the most distant outwork it would seem that while the girl of the one nation has a pure ideal, and often acts up to it, the other has no ideal at all, and hardly a sense of transgression when she fails. Is it culture that makes the difference? Is it not something of quite another order?

Into the lower middle-class developments we cannot here enter; indeed, we believe that neither in Germany nor in France is there the separation of ranks in education, especially among boys, that we are used to in England. Mr. Walter C. Perry, in a paper on 'German Schools' in *Macmillan's Magazine* for June 1877, says:—

'I enquired into the social position of the pupils whose performances in his form had excited my admiration, and was told that all classes of society were represented—*noblesse*, bankers, wealthy merchants, down to the smallest tradesmen—and that four of the boys in the form were sons of day labourers, who were unable to pay, without assistance, the marvellously small *Schulgeld*. This was about 4*l.* per annum.'

Prussia provides, besides the *Kindergärten* and elementary schools of which we have already spoken, the *Gewerbe* or business school; the *Realschule*, leading to a professional life, and teaching Latin; and the gymnasia, which teach the classics thoroughly and prepare for the universities. Of the

completeness of the teaching Mr. Perry, Mr. Matthew Arnold, and others speak highly, though the Rev. Edmund Guibert, an American clergyman who has contributed a set of papers on 'German Life' to the *American Churchman*, does not think it sufficiently thoroughgoing, nor equal to that of good American schools. The object kept in view is the cultivation of the average boy, leaving the superior intellects to cater for themselves, and in general avoiding the stimulus of prizes, honour lists, and competitive examinations, 'as tending to foster a servile view of education and to lead to spasmodic and exhausting efforts and feverish excitement rather than to the healthy and harmonious development of the mental powers.' Need we say how wise we think this decision?

In all these schools religion forms one lesson, given three times a week in the lower forms, twice in the upper. Being mostly day schools, the devotion and Sunday training do not form part of the scheme, so that they are specimens of the effects of teaching technical religious knowledge unconnected with either worship or moral conduct, since we are distinctly told that the master is merely a professor, not charged with the discipline of his boys, nor *in loco parentis*, like the head of a boarding school or house. Order depends on the class-master (*Ordinarius*), and, after him, on the 'Herr Director,' beyond whom is the 'Minister der geistlichen Unterrichts und Medicinal-Angelegenheiten.'

Out of school there are compulsory gymnastic exercises, but no conveniences for games, and the boys, to Mr. Perry's eyes, seemed quiet and spiritless. One of the directors assured him that

'the German boy was not indifferent to play, but that the authorities did nothing to promote it. I think,' he added, laughing, 'that they like a tame Philistine people; and besides, there is an ebullient energy in the English nature of which we know but little.'

Mr. Guibert adds, when advising his countrymen against sending a boy to these schools, that religion, as he has been trained to regard it, is unknown. Sunday, he is taught, is a day for secular pursuits, and the day above all the others in the week for attending the theatre or concert-room. Further, in all those methods of treatment which develop manliness and honour in a boy the German schools are thoroughly deficient. From the start it is taken for granted by his teachers that the boy will deceive and prevaricate whenever occasion offers.

The girls' schools are on the like system.

'It is the proud boast, and the just one too, of the German women that they alone, of all the modern femineities of the earth, are absolutely well educated. In ladies' schools it is not, as a rule, the mistresses who teach; they confine themselves to attending to the "creature comforts" of their pupils, and superintending the lower branches of needlework, &c. Competent masters are engaged to instruct their pupils in history, literature, modern languages, &c. The same professors that lecture to their brothers and cousins within the university halls and college class-rooms come down from those greater altitudes to teach the children and young girls in their day schools. They are taught regularly, systematically, patiently, lovingly.'—*German Home Life*, p. 179.

The Victoria School at Berlin, instituted by two Englishwomen—the Crown Princess and Miss Archer—educates 950 girls under the direction of Dr. Haarbrucker. It numbered, in 1876, 950 scholars, with 28 teachers—835 being Protestant, 107 Jewish, 2 Dissidents, and 2 Catholics. The curriculum of obligation consists of religion, German language and literature, French, geography, history, natural history (with physics), writing, drawing, singing, needlework (excused in the higher classes, if desired), and gymnastics; English is optional, but is generally studied. Mr. Payne witnessed a lesson of which he says:—

'There was nothing so remarkable as the fixed attention of the children. The order was perfect. All the sixty seemed to give themselves up to the work as if they were one; yet I consider that the number in the class was at least double what it ought to have been, and even the perfect order, which was unbroken, helped to cover the delusion that the minds of all could be suitably and simultaneously developed.'—*Visit to German Schools*, p. 152.

It was a class of girls between nine and eleven, who were learning to divide seventy-nine by five. Most village girls in England would surely be capable of far more at the same age, though probably they would work more mechanically.

There is very little active play among either German boys or girls, according to all observers. The boys sit about and smoke; the girls are not allowed to run, ride, take walks, boat, nor even to enjoy archery and croquet. The sexes are kept entirely apart, and the little girls chiefly amuse themselves with fancy work, eating sweetmeats, and giving small coffee parties among their schoolfellows, where little secrets, gossip, and sentimental friendships, and by-and-by small love fancies, begin to prevail. At least such is the judgment of an Englishwoman in Germany, and we have certainly seen corroboration thereof in the tales and stories of domestic life.

'The rite of Confirmation now comes. In Protestant Germany it means nothing of the religious enthusiasm, the ardent aspiration, the passionate resolves, that often mark the epoch in the minds of our young people. There is nothing of "recollection" or piety about the rite. It simply means, to those whom it most concerns, a long dress, visiting cards, a bouquet, a lace-frilled pocket-handkerchief, the *Du* of childhood exchanged for the *Sie* of young-ladyhood, and the potential *Schlafrack* and *Morgenhaube* for early hours. Visitors pour in to offer congratulations and presents; cake and wine and bustle pervade the domestic atmosphere; a droschky is hired, and the confirmed young Christian is driven out to pay visits and show off her finery.'—*German Home Life*, p. 127.

Let us shift to our other neighbour. The mother is the pervading influence of French education, as the school is of German instruction. The girls never leave their mother. Most of them never sleep out of her room, or one adjoining with the door open, till they are married. The boys, till they go to school, are likewise with her from morning to night. There is no nursery; the children eat and drink with their parents, and if there be a *bonne* she stands behind the high chair of the little one and feeds it. The children can hardly bear to be out of sight of their mother; and as the families are usually small, the constant companionship is possible. Moreover, their strong affection makes them singularly docile.

'The fact is—and it is a fact, however prodigious it may appear to people who have always believed the contrary—that the family bond is extraordinarily powerful in France. What we call "united families" are the rule there, and the unity goes far beyond our usual interpretation of the word. It means not only affection and mutual devotion, but it affects the instincts of the nation to such a point that colonising, and even to a certain degree foreign travel, are in many cases rendered impossible by it.'—*French Home Life*.

There is a good deal of minor indulgence, and want of discipline even while there is loving obedience. Many Frenchwomen view regularity and method as signs of a cold heart, incapable of feeling, and there is apt to be an easygoing disorderliness about the whole home life—doors left open, toys and clothes left about, loud shrill voices, and general untidiness and late hours—which with us would be bad signs, but which with the French mean nothing. Some girls, carefully guarded, attend classes in the towns, others are educated in convent schools, but the great proportion of them remain by their parents' side, living the family life, never going out alone, even in the country, and hardly ever spending an hour by themselves, and never entering into an independent conver-

sation with any person of the other sex. Thus French girls remain young longer than those of any other nation, and are on the whole ignorant of book-learning, and very simple-minded, and backward in all except the little arts of domestic economy and in amiable caressing manners. They never read novels (and very little of anything else), and are absolutely shielded from the knowledge of evil, even to the falsification of history to prevent them from knowing of scandals. When childhood is passing away comes the first Communion.

‘From it dates in many a girl the formation of her character, the consolidation of her faith, the frank acceptance of her duties and her pains. It goes home to every heart; its memory rests; old women talk of it as “le grand jour de ma vie.” The night before it the child kneels down and asks her father and her mother to pardon all her faults; then she goes gravely through the house and begs the same forgiveness from all its other inmates. When the morning comes she goes in white all over, shrouded in a long muslin veil, to join her comrades at the church; they, like herself, have been preparing themselves by two years of special instruction at the public catechism for the great day which has come at last. Then, amidst the roll of music and the pomp of ceremony, two columns of young children march slowly down the aisle and kneel right and left, boys on one side and girls on the other, until they have filled the nave. The church seems to be half choked with snow as the white sea of veils spreads over it. And when the great moment is reached at last, and the children advance slowly to the altar, there is not a dry eye around. Fathers, mothers, watch eagerly for their own, and afterwards, if death should take them while still young, that is the moment of their lives which is most tenderly and most tearfully remembered.’
—*French Home Life*, p. 63.

Of course we here allow for the fact that sensation and excitement are life to the French nature, and that our notion that quietness and earnestness go together, and that waters must be still to flow deep, is utterly alien to our neighbours and quite untrue of them. What here seems evident is, that religion is a real force, telling throughout the education of these girls, and that it bears fruit in their lives. The weak point is, as we know from the earnest exhortations of Bishop Dupanloup, that the intellect is left fallow, and that these good girls are taught not to think or argue, but simply to be pious, useful, and submissive. Mr. Hamerton, living in provincial society, is more emphatic on the almost ideal innocence of the French *demoiselle* and her subsequent excellence as a wife and mother. Her failures are chiefly owing to the narrowness of the ideal. She is not educated to stand alone, and she easily falls a prey to the petty and superstitious side of

her religion, and therefore fails to influence the men of her family.

Turn we to the boys of France. The mother is as careful of her son as of her daughter as long as he is under her wing, but that is seldom for long. She teaches him with all her heart 'to love his family and to believe in God. He learns one of two lessons almost always, but he rarely learns the other.' The mother, we are told on the same authority, cannot 'lift her boy into a thorough man.' No mother can alone. That is left for the father, and still more for other lads of his age, to do. And every boy is well-nigh compelled to go through a regular graduated course of instruction at *lycées*, the Parisians and other inhabitants of large towns being day scholars, those from the country being boarders. We have not the materials for describing the intellectual training of these *lycées*, but we believe it to be thoroughly methodical and uniform, and tested by regular examinations, when the foremost scholars are rewarded by prizes of books, and at the same time crowned with artificial laurels, gilded or green, according to their merits. Once a year the head boys of the different *lycées* have a general competition, and to succeed in this is glory indeed. Unwillingness to study is not the ordinary fault of a French boy, for in him, as in all his nation, the intellectual inclinations surpass those of the animal.

But the whole *lycée* system is constructed with the most elaborate care, on purpose to prevent that kind of education which boys, without intending it, bestow on one another whenever they are left to themselves, and not, as in Germany, so much instructed as to have no room or energy for sport. We quote from the personal experiences of the Rev. Stephen Hawtrey, which are indeed of forty years ago, but which describe pretty accurately the plans of management still in vogue ever since. We give the outline of a day :—

'We were awake by a servant knocking at and unlocking the doors of our *cellules*, and presently the master (*maître d'étude*) who presided in our room for study (*salle d'étude*) appeared, and walked up and down in front of our *cellules* while we dressed and washed, our washhand-basins being placed in the alcoves of the windows of the wide, airy corridor in front of our *cellules*, where the *maître d'étude* was walking up and down. Of these *maîtres d'étude* I should think there were about eight—one for each class. There were in each class about twenty-five to thirty boarders (*internes*).

'When dressed we fell into rank, two and two, and, under the guidance of our *maître d'étude*, marched to a long corridor in front of the eight *salles d'étude*, where the lessons were prepared. Here the different classes fell into their proper places, each under their especial

maitre d'étude, and forming a long double line, we faced inward and . . . knelt for morning prayer.'—*A French Eton*, p. 18.

Then followed the preparation of lessons—a master sitting at the head of each table, not to assist, but simply to keep his eyes upon the boys. Then came breakfast—*i.e.* a hunch of bread taken from a basket in the playground, and eaten walking about, and usually dry, though in some cases parents provided butter, jam, or fruit to make it palatable; nor was there any drink save water from pitchers ranged round the wall. Meantime the boys were watched not only by the *maitre d'étude*, but by the censor and sub-censor.

Two hours of work with the professor—the real teacher—followed. There was good teaching, and a fair amount of attention from the boys, though with plenty of ingenuity mispent in eluding the stress of study. Then came writing out of notes or exercises under the eye of the *maitre d'étude*. Dinner followed, and recreation, but with the guardians still walking about the playgrounds, never losing sight of the boys. The playgrounds were large turfed enclosures, and the boys had gardens, rabbit-hutches, and the like, but everything they did was under surveillance. After an hour came preparations under the *maitre d'étude's* eye, then two hours of lessons from the professors, *golfer*, an hour's play, two hours' preparation, supper, recreation, prayers, and bed; but even when the lads were thus disposed of there was a servant walking up and down the passages all night.

The whole, as Mr. Hawtrey testifies, was thoroughly considered and intended to prevent the possibility of wrongdoing. It is, in fact, the Jesuit system, more or less secularised, and it prevails in all the boarding schools of France, satisfying the excellent anxious mothers that their sons can neither hurt themselves nor do wrong.

But, says our witness—

'it was an entire failure. This system of constant supervision was deadening, stupefying. The eye ever resting on us was oppressive to the last degree. You will not be surprised to learn that it induced a morbid habit of mind; we were oppressed by a morbid and unhealthy longing to *get out of sight*.'—P. 28.

Five boys dug a burrow under a rabbit-hutch for the mere purpose of feeling themselves unseen, and Mr. Hawtrey himself used to spend his time in a dry ditch, modelling clay, merely because he was there sheltered from the watchfulness, which, though incessant, was merely mechanical, and included neither companionship nor sympathy. The studies were

watched, not assisted ; the sports guarded, not shared ; nor was there any attempt to comfort or help in sorrow. The repression of possible misbehaviour was the whole moral training, except what might be derived from sermons, from the preparation for the first Communion, and from the confessor—both these last being voluntary and standing quite apart from the machinery of the school, as we are now often told the religion of our children ought to do. Let us take the result from *French Home Life* :—

‘The boys are girlish ; at least no other adjective expresses so correctly their peculiar disposition. The word is not quite true, however, for the boys have defects which the girls have not. The latter are frank and straightforward ; the former are not only feminine, they are something more and something worse. One word has been found sufficient in our language to express it. We must perforce say “sneak ;” and here is the great distinction between boys and girls which was alluded to at the commencement of this chapter. . . . The boys are little-minded, pettifogging, and positively cowardly as we understand cowardice in England. . . . Want of religious faith, of political conviction, of resolute will, of devotion to a cause, will continue to mournfully distinguish the population of France so long as the boys continue to be sneaks. Many of them, however, are agreeable enough to chatter with. They generally have good manners (they beat us there) ; they are almost always tender-hearted and loving ; they are even tolerably obedient ; and, judging solely from the outside, it might be imagined that they promise well. They are devoted sons and faithful brothers ; they work hard at books ; while they are little they say their prayers ; but there is no stuff in them. Discipline makes them brave if they should become soldiers ; tradition does the same for the better born amongst them ; but it is wonderful that such boys should have any latent courage at all, for their whole early teaching seems to us invented on purpose to drive it out. They are forbidden to fight, and scarcely ever get beyond scratching.’—*French Home Life*, p. 72.

In truth, the French notion of training seems to be nothing but constant espionage, which is tenderly affectionate in the family ; religious, and therefore loving, in the convent and the seminary ; mechanical and hard in the *lycée* ; and petty and hateful beyond measure in the ordinary *pension* for girls, to which our mania for Parisian pronunciation makes English governesses resort.

The upshot of it is that the ordinary Frenchman has intensified the natural failings of his race. He views religion as the grace and protection of woman, the *spécialité* of priests, whom he hardly views as men ; he is a devoted son, a kind brother ; but he has no notion of a strong restraining spirit of

piety exalting morality. Religion has come to him as something apart from either culture or self-government, and is connected with such a quantity of 'pious opinions' and commandments of men taught as doctrines that his growing intellect has rejected it altogether. More or less of dissipation involves his youth until he is induced to *se ranger*, when he becomes in general as loving a husband and father as he has been a son, although his choice has in general been simply a matter of interest and family arrangement, and his wife would have regarded a preference for him on her part before marriage as an impropriety. Home is his religion, and it is passionately loved; but there his principles and affections begin and end. The religion that has disconnected piety and material truth cannot hold its men, and he views it only as the sentiment and the police of females, lives without it, and if he dies with its rites does so more in concession to his wife's tears than from any conviction of its truth.

The national faults that have thus grown up do not seem to be the corrupt morals which the Court of the last century and the novels of all times have led us to associate with the French, so much as an utter lack of manliness, steadfastness, and appreciation of truth. A brilliant falsehood is vastly preferable to a sober truth in their eyes. Therefore they believe in nothing save that France is invincible and that all her battles are victories. And thus they have frittered away the substance of that national character which has produced the noblest and most attractive among the children of the West—S. Bernard, Louis IX., Vincent de Paul, Fénelon, Montalembert—and which still produces persons of a peculiar sweet saintliness of which we know not till they pass from earth and take their place as stars in the firmament of the Church for ever.

Where such grow up it is under Catholic training. But it is as if it had been said to France, 'Half of thy heart we consecrate,' and while Eugénie de Guérin grows up a gentle, resolute saint, her brother Maurice becomes a wretched, sickly sceptic, pining for the faith of which he has been robbed.

Religion for woman, culture for man, says France. We see the result—admirable women in all classes, unailing in grace and good manners, though lacking the power of thought and influence which deeper studies might have given, and did give in the early seventeenth century; and men for the most part stunted and one-sided, and strangely deficient in manly qualities. They may all be studied in the admirable typical portraits drawn by Lord Lytton in his *Parisians*, and certainly

the siege of Paris has shown that French culture too often fails in producing manliness.

We turn back once more to the results of culture on the great nation which is at present the successful rival of France. We will begin with the religious status of Prussia. Curiously enough, that country, after owing its greatness to a Julian, came, after an interval, under a Constantius, who, with a more absolute despotism than even that of the Augustus, succeeded in crushing up together, rather than blending, the Lutherans and Calvinists of his dominions, and in the process squeezed out of them both whatever small remnants of spirit and zeal were left. Since that fusion, which some among us regard as an example, nothing has remained but the driest, most tasteless residuum, for which no one cares. The present Emperor, one of the few men who cherish and avow faith and devotion, was derided throughout his dominions for professing, like the benighted princes of the Middle Ages, to reign 'by the grace of God.' When he strove to revive religion in his dominions he found it a dead letter.

'Orthodoxy (what was orthodoxy?) was no longer required in a clergyman; but the new programme prescribed that piety must be petted, parsons encouraged, and the public invited to raise a louder voice in the affairs of religion. Congresses were called, synods were summoned, but all to no effect.'—*German Home Life*, p. 304.

There was utter indifference; 'the heart of Prussia was pagan to the core.' Theological students fall off, *though* orthodoxy be no requisite. In 1831 the two Prussian universities reckoned 2,203 divinity students. In 1873 there were but 740. One-third of those who had gone up intending to study theology gave it up before the time for ordination, and hardly any of the educated burgher class, who used to furnish the clergy, now think of entering the pastorate. There are not enough to be found even of those who would gain social rank as *Pfarrern*, and many parsonages stand vacant in the country from absolute lack of clergy. The stipends have remained stationary in the general depreciation of the value of money; no one cares enough about the matter to enlarge them, and there are no prizes, nor is there influence enough to tempt an earnest man to assume the care of souls without fee. All the pastor has to do is to farm, to pass candidates for confirmation, to read the inoffensive expurgated liturgy of the late reunion, and to preach a colourless sermon on Sunday; and when the *Herrschaft* happens to be at the family seat, he is summoned to take a hand at cards on the Sunday

evening, not even enjoying the consideration of his brother at the manse in Scotland.

In towns, there is still generally some able and eloquent man whose church is frequented by the ladies at whom their neighbours sneer as Pietists. But not even these meet on an equality. No one thinks of finding in him a comforter, adviser, or guide *ex officio*; he is the associate of the shopkeepers from whom he has sprung and nothing more.

Nothing amazes Germans so much in our domestic novels as the status of the clergy and their families, but they take this, as well as our church-going habits, as an outcome of that insular enthusiasm at which they smile. And it is not only the men to whom these observations apply. The ladies can vie with their husbands in regarding religion as a contemptible mummary. We extract a terrible passage:—

‘It is true that in Northern Germany every sort of graceful legend and saga has been invented to clothe the Child Christ and render Him attractive in infant eyes. And what is the outcome of all these fanciful fables? Simply that they sow the seeds of unbelief in the little mind, which later on finds, to its dismay, that the religion of childhood can never be the religion of riper years. All the fanciful fictions and wild sweet myths, which made the child worship with the Magi and tremble at the manger, he finds to be but so many foolish fables invented to cheat his innocence. He has no time to sift the wheat from the chaff; the whole Christian faith is but a field of tares to him, across which his path no longer lies. Heaven has been brought down to the child, the child has not been drawn up to heaven, and as a being drawing thoughtful breath, he turns away disgusted from these sickly human inventions to reach, if it may be through hail and storm, a purer air. “What!” cried our hostess at a coffee party, “what! is anyone hypocritical enough *heut zu Tage* to say he or she believes the Bible or the Testament to be different from any other book?”

‘Indignant disclaimers of such base superstition re-echoed on all sides.’—*German Home Life*, p. 281.

The ladies do not, for the most part, busy themselves in studying the speculative opinions of their lords. They are much more absorbed in their *Wirtschaft* than in controversy, and content themselves with knowing that they need not trouble themselves about what their husbands say is all nonsense, and is only believed by the stupid and unenlightened. So their faith fails as soon as they have ceased to watch for the *Christkind* coming down the chimney to put their gifts on the Christmas tree. His cradle songs have become about as sacred to them as the *Nibelung*, and the tree

revives the story of the ash Yggdrasil, thus drawing all mankind together by sweet common sentiments free from dogma.

To this point of intellectual culture has the maiden advanced when she has finished her education and been confirmed, which is analogous to 'coming out.' She has learnt her languages, her music, drawing, and other studies more scientifically and thoroughly than most English girls, far more so than the generality of French ones; but the force of public opinion is in favour of affecting to be the uninstructed, soft, interesting creature who was the fashion in England at the beginning of the century. Any pursuit of intellectual subjects is denounced as blue, strong-minded, or the like, and when the women of a family do read, they keep their books out of sight, and have no notion of making them part of the attractions of the drawing-room. The energetic spirit of self-improvement, and the longing for usefulness, which is part of an average English girl's nature, is unknown to the generality. Charity has gone with faith and hope. Institutions founded by English-born princesses are barely kept alive by subscriptions out of deference to the Court. The exceptional women in whom the struggling embers of Christianity awake yearnings for the care of the poor find openings as deaconesses, and in a few of the towns ladies visit and inspect the schools; but whereas in England half the girls one meets in society are cottage visitors, district visitors, Sunday school teachers, members of working parties, managers of church music, parish workers of some sort or other, the German *Fräulein* is merely ornamental in the afternoon.

The avowed object of culture is, we suppose, to produce the most perfectly effective and refined beings of their kind possible—men and women brave and strong, yet large-minded, pure, gentle, courteous, and appreciative of beauty in literature and art, and carrying this appreciation out in every word and deed of public or domestic life. That German men are strong and scholarly, and German women domestic, no one has ever doubted; but what has the present form of culture done for their civilisation and refinement? It may be a national custom that German gentlemen sit still to be waited upon by the ladies, and a chivalrous Englishman, who cannot bear to see them carrying his coffee cup and cake, is simply supposed to be dreadfully restless, and unable to wait for his turn to be helped. But it does not seem to us to be so much refinement as a remnant of barbarism.

Again, it may be more refined to 'call a spade a spade,' if you have to mention it, or anything else less fit for ears

polite. But true refinement certainly shows itself in never mentioning such things without necessity, and, if we may trust our author, such reticence is not to be found among the ladies with whom she associated. Indeed, as a rule there is all over the Continent much more simplicity and directness of speech than we are accustomed to think of as delicate. But coarseness does not lie so much in calling things by their right names as in mentioning them gratuitously. In the matter of interjections neither German nor Catholic French women have what we call any regard for the Third Commandment. In the case of the latter we can only suppose that their confessors and catechisms cannot consider such exclamations sinful. At any rate, the mere law of refinement would surely condemn exaggerated and inappropriate exclamations, and to English ears the calls upon sacred Names on all trivial occasions are simply dreadful.

According to our authoress, scandal reigns pre-eminent in the coffee-drinkings of the high-born matrons. We will not take the statement as universal. There are, no doubt, circles where there is more of intellectual conversation ; but when we consider the pains that are spent on the education of these ladies, surely the general tone of conversation ought to be on something beyond the household, its servants, its births, deaths, and marriages. A lady who translates a poem, or carries on the work of self-improvement, should not be put down as not in good taste in model cultivated society.

And as to sense of beauty, the reception room is bare of all ornament save a cluster of family photographs on the walls, a glass cabinet with a few bits of china and such curiosities in it, and the wool-work on chairs and sofas, arranged without an eye for colour. Upstairs, refinement takes the, to us, curious form of thinking a bath an improper article of furniture, and reducing the size of the washhand-basin. The room is as bare as a servant's bedroom, and the German matron replies to the Englishwoman who has been used to make her nest graceful and pretty, 'You are impractical. Who would there be to see it? No one but my husband, who would scold me well and never cease grumbling at my extravagance. Dark window-blinds, well-covered cotton curtains, a strip of bedside carpet, and a few chairs are enough for anyone's wants.' Art is all very well for a picture gallery or a theatre, but in German opinion it is merely impractical at home. There is no attempt to bring beauty and grace into the home side of life. Perhaps we are, especially at this moment, inclined to indulge too much in the quest of

the beautiful, and the average Englishwoman may overload her table and crowd her rooms with what is not strictly in good taste. If German bareness sprang from the desire to be strictly neat and clean with little expense, we should not complain; but, alas! cleanliness is not a virtue in vogue. The terrible scourge of typhoid fever testifies to the general indifference to such matters as one would have thought it the first duty of physical science to inculcate.

No baby's head is ever washed for six months, and the English fashion of using cold water is credited with the blindness of the King of Hanover. The ordinary morning *déshabillé* in which the family stand, snatching their morning meal round the bare table, is the dressing-gown and loose cap. Our authoress, appearing in the usual trim quiet morning dress of an English gentlewoman, was laughed at, and asked whether she expected the Grand Duke. The afternoon visiting dress and the evening garb are splendid in comparison with an English lady's, but—if we may take the verdict of France, England, and America—alike conspicuous for servile and tasteless adhesion to French fashions and ill-assorted colours. Trifles, perhaps, but symptoms certainly, and symptoms are estimated by what they show, not by their size.

At the beginning of *German Home Life* there is a letter from a German, owning that its chapters (which had appeared in *Fraser's Magazine*) thoroughly photograph German society, but excusing much on the ground of the national poverty. We allow that the bareness of the rooms and much besides are thus accounted for, but we cannot allow the plea for coarseness of manners and want of delicacy. 'Plain living and high thinking' should go together, and we have only to turn to American literature to see how compatible they are. For if there are colossal fortunes and boundless luxury across the Atlantic, there are also thousands of families where the ladies are the only housewives and the means are small, yet where the treatment of woman is chivalrously, almost spoilingly, tender and considerate, language is chastened into purity (we do not mean of accent), and taste and refinement are cultivated. No, we cannot accept the German's plea for the national boorishness.

Nay, there are other matters on which we hardly dare touch, above all on the authority of a book that paints so much *en noir*, but we fear that it is a patent fact that the 'holy estate of matrimony' has lost much of its holiness in the eyes of this people. The toleration of lax morals in servants, to which we have alluded, is the token of a strange

indifference to purity. Marriages are reckoned at 39 per cent. in England, but at only 19 per cent. in Germany. The restrictions and difficulties in all ranks are as numerous 'as though it were a state of vice instead of a state of virtue,' and the long delay too often leads to the man, at least, living in 'a state of vice.' And even marriage itself is but a feeble tie. Mutual dislike, family quarrels, and various trivial pretexts are sufficient for a divorce. Astonished English may hear a gentleman at the *table d'hôte* say, speaking of the portly countess opposite to him, 'When I had the honour of being the husband of madame;' nay, the writer of *German Home Life* declares as a fact that in her own family there was an old general, a Waterloo man, who played whist every evening with three divorced wives. Again, she tells of two brothers marrying two sisters, quarrelling, divorcing, exchanging partners, and finally, on the death of one husband and one wife, the two survivors being remarried. The famous 'Double Arrangement' in the *Anti-Jacobin* is here surpassed.

All this is not the growth of one generation. Immorality has been the bane of Germany throughout its history. The little courts of the last century were hotbeds of vice, and the memoirs of German princesses such as Elizabeth Charlotte of the Rhine and Frederica of Prussia are too plain-spoken to be readable in the present day. These things may not be new; but what is the mission of culture, if not to change them?

There used to be a belief among English parents that the *Sorrows of Werther* were all that was to be read in German, except what were freely classed as infidel books, therefore that it was as well not to let their daughters read that language. Then came a revulsion. There were Schiller, and Schlegel, and Fouqué, to say nothing of the great Goethe. The world smiles at its past weakness; and every young lady in the land puzzles at her *Lesebuch*; everyone who can string a rhyme attempts a translation of the *Erlkönig*. Not very unfortunately, a good many still remain floundering in the compound sentences when they are released from the school-room, and never do acquire German enough to read for amusement.

For though of course there is much that is innocent and excellent reading, yet, besides those works of Hegel, Strauss, &c., which, as everyone knows, well deserve the old stigma, the nation has reflected its corruption in much of its lighter literature. Take, for instance, Friedrich Spielhagen's *Breaking of the Storm*, translated, we are sorry to say, by two English

ladies. It is a picture of terrible hollowness and corruption of society, both among nobles and burghers, and of hatred of classes one against the other, while the plot is founded on a fraudulent speculation conducted with more than common treachery. The two most honest men in the book are—sad omen—of the elder generation, an old general and a master builder; but the sons of both are alike worthless men, whose vices are treated almost as matters of course. The builder, Ernst Schmidt, regards the nobility with so bitter and unrelenting a hatred that even when General von Werben, on the discovery of how far matters have gone between Lieutenant Ottomar von Werben and Ferdinanda Schmidt, would have waived all objections and consented to the marriage, he refuses all consent. The real heroine, Elsa von Werben, and old Schmidt's nephew, an able and upright merchant captain, do indeed conduct themselves fairly well, and marry prosperously; but the story of poor Ferdinanda's love and death is that of a heathen woman, and throughout love is so entirely the lord of most, if not all, the women of the story, that Christianity seems to be never looked on as a restraining power. Even the good old general feels no shame or doubt in sending his innocent daughter Elsa to associate with his sister, who had disgraced her marriage and was still living in the power of her former lover, an Italian adventurer, whom she could not marry on pain of forfeiture of her estates. He is the prime villain of the book, or rather the demon moving all the minor villains, of whom Ottomar is the chief victim. Having been drawn into the web of fraud, so as to taint his honour as an officer, the miserable young man is tried by court martial and dismissed the service. This is viewed as tantamount to being condemned to die by his own hand. His father himself loads the pistol with which he is to end his life, and sends it to him; but Ottomar's escape, and with Ferdinanda, is managed by a certain easy-going and disreputable Bertalda, only, however, to be overtaken by a maniac lover of the girl's. She perishes in saving Ottomar from his dagger, and Ottomar is soon after killed in the great tempest which gives name to the book and does a great deal of execution in the third volume. The tissue of wickedness and horror connected with this madman, and the unprincipled conduct of almost every person concerned in the story, can hardly be described. Even the almost angelic blind girl, Cilli, promotes and counsels the flight of Ferdinanda after this fashion:—

‘And may God be with you,’ said Cilli, laying her hands on

Ferdinanda's head, who had thrown herself on her knees before her— 'with you both. He only asks for love, and yet again for love, the love that beareth all things. You can now, you can both now prove that your love is true love.'

This is to an unmarried girl fleeing with a dishonoured, disgraced, and guilty soldier. It was to save his life indeed; but is not this the dangerous confusion of right and pseudo-generosity that is most to be deprecated, the blasphemous application of what is said of heavenly love to that which is 'earthly, sensual, devilish,' the very fault of the worst French novels?

And we fear that this is not an exceptional book, and that it does to a certain degree represent the tone of feeling and morality where the Christian faith has become little more than a vague sentiment, and *der liebe Gott* is little more than the God of nature, and is chiefly known in expletives. Alas! we fear that Prussia was but too truly, though unconsciously, portrayed in the romance of *Sintram*, the offspring of her best days, when fresh from the patriotic struggle with the First Napoleon.

Is not the Fatherland only too like the youth, a Christian in name indeed, but with his gentle mother, the Church, driven away to pray for him in her cloisters while he is delivered up to the might of his strong hereditary passions for ambition, violence, and dominion, while the demons of lust and gain haunt his dreams? May the better hope, the truer spirit of faith and love, return! May he take hold at last of better things, not as the demon prompts, but in patience and penitence!

For if *Sintram* had followed the bidding of the Little Master and had snatched at Gabrielle, she must either have perished or have lost all that rendered her truly lovely and precious. Is it not even thus with things fair and good, and all that culture gives? If it do not come through, and for the sake of, God, it is nothing worth, and fails in the using.

For verily we have not written these things in censoriousness of our neighbour nations, but in fear and trembling for ourselves. The experiment of culture alone is urged on us, and it would be tried all over the country were it not that we have a strong tenacity of purpose and habit of acting and managing for ourselves, and of paying dearly in order to do so, such as cannot easily be forced into a centralisation.

Before submitting, then, it is well to look forth and see the effects on our neighbours. Culture has been tried to the utmost on both sexes in Germany, and on the men in France. What has been the effect? In France, apparently, the strength of

manhood has been sapped, while in Germany, though there is no lack of strength and vigour, the intellectual training of the boy and girl has left untouched the rude coarseness and narrowness of the men and women.

It is the old story of knowledge apart from wisdom. It is wisdom that purifies and refines, and to dis sever it from instruction is a fatal thing. Where the teacher of the intellect is not in his degree the guide to faith, devotion, and morality, the three mysterious threads of the human being of the pupil are pulled away, and unequally, and there will be a jar of body, soul, or spirit. Consider this, you who argue that a non-religious education is not an irreligious education, and that while the intellect is fed at school religion may be a dessert offered by a different hand, while conduct is an extraneous matter.

ART. VII.—A BROAD CHURCH BISHOP.

Memoir of Alexander Ewing, D.C.L., Bishop of Argyll and the Isles. By ALEXANDER J. ROSS, B.D., Vicar of S. Philip's, Stepney. 1877. (Daldy, Isbister, & Co., 56 Ludgate Hill.)

IF there be a country in the world in which Episcopacy is on its trial, that country is Scotland. It is there exposed to the rivalry of a form of the Christian religion which retains the fundamental doctrines of the faith; it ministers to flocks composed of elements identical with those of the various Bodies, Free and Established, around them; and it is inevitable that comparisons should be constantly drawn between the two polities—the Episcopal and Presbyterian. The spiritual results of each will be carefully scanned. The Scottish Church, like all branches of the ancient Catholic organisation, makes a high claim for itself; and the inquiry will certainly be made how far that claim is justified by facts, how far the intensity of spiritual force generated within her pale, how far the spiritual standard reached by her sons and daughters, recommends the claim made in her traditions and formularies to an organisation of Apostolic authority, to a ministerial commission transmitted through successive generations, direct from the Founder of Christianity Himself.

Especially will such a severity of criticism follow the persons and the actions of the Bishops themselves. Upon the Catholic theory to which we have been referring, they are the foremost men of their communion—the *élite* of its entire ministry. It is true that the 'gift which is in them' does not include personal infallibility, and has never been even supposed necessarily to guarantee learning, or ability, or even holiness of life. It has a strictly defined purpose, viz., to continue the ministry of the Church and to guarantee the grace of the Sacraments. Whatever is not precisely involved in these objects cannot be supposed to be supplied by that which is confined to the attainment of them alone. But, nevertheless, the higher be the conception which is formed of the Episcopate, the more exacting surely will be the tests applied to the men who are to bear and to exercise it; and any Church will be acting with criminal levity and disrespect of the gift committed to its guardianship, which selects, or suffers to be selected, any other than its foremost sons to fill an office so exacting and so august.

The Episcopate may be characterised in fact as *the most highly vitalised* portion of the Church's organisation, and the motive power of the whole. If even a part of its spiritual force be neutralised by its being committed to unfit men,—men, that is to say, whose natural powers or whose acquired habits do not work in harmony with the requirements of their office—men whose want of learning causes it to be lightly esteemed, whose secularity of temper finds a *spiritual* office uncongenial, or, worse than all, whose want of faith paralyses spiritual energy, and saps with secret decay all the life of the dioceses entrusted to them—then the Church whose chief pastors are such as these will find herself, just in the proportion in which their influence and example extend, unfruitful within her own borders and unable, perhaps even undesirous, to extend those borders; in short, she will have failed in her mission. Of so great importance to a Church are pious and faithful bishops. And in following this train of thought, which the perusal of the memoir before us has aroused in our minds, we by no means intend to prejudge the career of the bishop who is its subject, but merely seek to indicate some of the conditions under which it was run.

Alexander Ewing, first Bishop after its revival of the ancient diocese of Argyll and the Isles, was born in 1814 at Aberdeen, and was therefore a Highlander *pur sang*. His childhood was not eventful until the loss, when he was but in his fourteenth year, of his father by death, which was followed

in the next year by that of his mother, and speedily afterwards of an only sister, thus leaving him and his brother alone in the world. We need not linger over his youth and early manhood. It was a scrambling kind of education that he got; first at one place, then at another; and for a considerable time not even the pretence of learning was kept up. The two youths received occasional attention from their guardians; but in a general way they seem to have lived where they pleased and done what seemed good in their own eyes. 'It surprised their neighbours somewhat,' says their biographer, 'that two youths, without a tutor or other senior, should be left so entirely without any visible control over their actions.' Well it might!

One consequence of this unrestrained freedom of action was that the elder brother became engaged to be married before he was twenty; but on the whole it answered better than could have been expected. The younger brother, John, was, indeed, afterwards brought under more systematic training at Oxford, was ordained in the Church of England, and is at the present time, we believe, rector of Westmill, in Herts. But with a brief attendance at some of the classes of the University of Edinburgh in 1834-5, Alexander Ewing's *status pupillaris* came to an end. The deficiency in theological learning, as in power of exact thought, which the inadequacy of his early studies left in his mind, cannot be said to have been ever quite filled up. The miscellaneous gatherings of his subsequent reading, which, however, seems to have lain but little along the severer and more arduous paths of literature, and the powers of a mind rather elegant than massive, enabled him to reach a respectable proficiency in one or two directions. But there was always an amateur air about most of his work. He never at any period of his life had any pretension to have gone below the surface of systematic theology; and the consequence was that he was always more or less at the mercy of theological quacks. What he might have been and have done, had his unquestionable powers been educed and bent to work in youth by serious and continuous training, and his memory stored with the elements of the higher knowledge, it is hard to say. For the present we resume the thread of the narrative before us.

He married in 1835, three months after he was twenty-one, and tried to settle down to the tranquil enjoyment of that 'love in a cottage' which so many have dreamed of in their callow youth. He does not seem to have felt the slightest need or desire for a *career* at this time. We hear nothing

of any whispers of ambition, or any stirrings of latent powers in his nature. 'Here I should like to live all my life,' he says, 'with Katherine and John, and my books and the river.' But his Eden-dream was soon shattered by an attack of illness which came near being a fatal one; and a long tedious convalescence, followed by a change of residence, opened new horizons in his life; and it is at this point that we hear first of an inclination towards the sacred ministry. He was attracted at first towards the English Church. 'He had discovered,' we are told, 'and been attracted by the comprehensiveness of many of her great affirmations on the subject of the redemption of humanity; while life in an English country parsonage seemed to him the ideal of quiet beauty and secluded usefulness.' But we are not surprised to find that he shrank from the labour and excitement of a career at Oxford or Cambridge, although encouraged by the Bishop of Winchester, to whom he applied on the subject, and ultimately he *drifted* by the force of events towards the ministry of the Scottish Episcopal Church. His biographer relates the circumstances which precipitated his decision at last, in a passage whose curiously infelicitous wording is characteristic, and will meet us often:—

'He was led by a special combination of circumstances seriously to entertain the thought of applying for orders in the Scottish Episcopal Church. For there were those, and they too Episcopalians, who seemed to have been of opinion that Mr. Ewing was possessed of ministerial gifts which no ordination by human hands could insure, and on the 9th of March, 1837, a formal proposal was made to him to undertake the charge of the Episcopalian congregation at Elgin. This proposal he declined, chiefly on the ground of his own inexperience; but that it should have been addressed to him while still a layman, and only in his twenty-third year, by his own immediate neighbours, must be regarded as the highest testimony that could be borne by them to his religious character and intellectual endowment; and there is no doubt that this entirely unexpected manifestation of feeling on the part of the Elgin congregation first suggested the question whether there might not be special work for him to do in the Scottish Episcopal Church.'—(p. 35.)

Still more odd are the circumstances that followed. This proposal from Elgin seems to have dropped; Mr. Ewing determined to spend one or two years abroad; and, *therefore*, 'formed the resolution of applying for admission to the ministry of the Scottish Episcopal Church.' We confess that after all the biographer's elaborate explanations, we are unable to understand the *therefore*; and we refrain from ascribing hypothetical reasons. The material fact is that he was

ordained deacon by Bishop Low, of Ross and Moray, in 1838, without cure or title as far as appears, and left Scotland a fortnight afterwards to spend some years upon the Continent. On this we must needs observe with his biographer that the determination to give some years to foreign travel 'might have been reason enough for deferring to a future day' this step of ordination. Probably his course was regarded as nothing unusual in the Scottish Church then. We have no reason to suppose that the same Church, in the earnestness of her great revival, would tolerate anything like this now. But in that day of small things in the sister Church it was then more unusual than happily it is now to find men of good family and competent fortune offering themselves for ordination; and they were eagerly accepted when they did come. Still, it is manifest that to treat the ministry as a mere ornament and subordinate adjunct of a country gentleman's life was not to give it its due; and there must have been a certain sense of unreality in a solemn ordination to the ministry which was followed by no corresponding action, and, for the moment at least, was treated as if it were of no account.

He remained abroad at Pisa, Lucca, and Rome about three years, living the usual *dilettante* life of the English abroad, but growing strong physically, and growing also in mental breadth and stature. His correspondence during this time is much occupied with Italian Art, as was not unnatural.

In 1841 he returned to Scotland, was ordained a priest by the Bishop of Aberdeen, and undertook clerical *duty* for the first time in the charge of a congregation at Forres. During some four years of quiet work in that charge, Mr. Ewing distinguished himself, as his biographer seems to think, by the part which he took in the controversies of the day. It may, at all events, be conceded that he had taken his line and declared it decidedly enough on two important questions—the disabilities of the Scottish Episcopal Church and the Scottish Communion Office, to which he thus early declared his hostility. He was now thirty-three years of age; and we are next to find him elected and consecrated Bishop of Argyll and the Isles. The circumstances under which he became bishop were somewhat peculiar.

The office of bishop in the Scottish Church is an onerous one; and apostolic as in other respects, so in this, that it is not burdened with the goods of this world. Bishop Eden, speaking in 1861 at London House on behalf of the Argyll Fund, makes the remarkable statement that 'the Scotch bishops for some years have been living on incomes of £127

a year, and that without any house or residence.' We believe that matters are somewhat better now; but at that time it was evidently impossible for any but rich men to accept the Episcopal office in Scotland. Mr. Ewing was a man of competent means, and did not need to depend upon the small endowment of the see (which never amounted to more than £270 a year); on the contrary, he spent his own private fortune liberally upon it in his early years as bishop. But the fact of the general poverty of the see tended most undesirably to limit the choice of possible men for bishops; and to make the selection turn, not so much upon learning or mental power or personal fitnesses of any kind as on the possession of pecuniary means to enable the bishop-elect to live independently of official emoluments, and to uphold in temporal matters the dignity of the Episcopate. We are not saying that the other necessary pre-requisites were in practice neglected, but that they could not be made the *sole criteria*; and this was bad. Bishop Ewing himself draws the inference in a letter to the Hon. G. Boyle in 1855:—

'In the Episcopal Church, according to the theory of its constitution, more than in any other system, it must always hold good that, "if the head suffers, all the members suffer with it;" and I am of opinion that, until something is done to enable us to hold our episcopates without constant pecuniary anxiety, no real good will be effected by our Church. It is true that we *can* get down wealthy men from England; but this mode of filling the Scottish bench does not develop the resources of the native Church, does not foster the real growth of the native plant. I do think that, if our bishops and deans could be provided with such means for the efficient discharge of their offices as are supplied even to the Colonial bishops and deans, we should find the road opening to a better state of things in Scotland.'—(p. 244.)

Without undervaluing the many estimable qualities that afterwards showed themselves in him, it was probably more because he was a wealthy man than for any other reason that Mr. Ewing, a comparatively young man, and quite undistinguished in every way, was selected by Bishop Low to administer the refounded diocese for which he himself had, with marked and splendid generosity, provided a modest endowment of £7,000. He was confirmed as bishop after some delay and demur, consecrated at Aberdeen in 1847, and seems to have thrown himself at once with great energy and devotion into the work of his diocese. 'He was at once initiated,' says his biographer, 'into that locomotive amphibious kind of life which must be led by every Bishop of Argyll

and the Isles who simply does his duty.' He had made the circuit of his scattered diocese, we are told, before a month was over; and then at once proceeded to hold a Synod of the revived diocese at Oban. His first charge, delivered at this Synod, appears to us a very suitable one. It shows, indeed, already the signs of that disposition in the bishop's mind habitually to dissociate the sign and the thing signified—the outward and the inward—in the ordinances of the Church, and to depreciate the former, of which we shall see the workings later on. For the present the material interests of his diocese required his consideration; and no man could have set himself to supply these with more judgment and goodwill, nor, we may add, with more munificent liberality, than did Bishop Ewing. The scattered communities of Episcopalians in the Highlands and Islands were sadly in want of his pastoral care. 'There were wanted additional pastors, schoolmasters, schoolmistresses, churches, parsonages, school-houses, Gaelic Bibles and Prayer-books.' The Synod service was held, it seems, 'within the old abbey [at Iona], and was the subject of a sketch in the *Illustrated Times* of the day;' but 'so great was the sectarian bitterness displayed by certain Scotch papers, that the Duke of Argyll was moved to write to the bishop a remonstrance on the invasion of his private property,' a want of courtesy which seems scarcely credible to those who have no personal acquaintance with the rancour which theological differences can occasion in Scotland. The bishop was not without other reminders that his very existence was an offence to some of his Presbyterian neighbours, who seem hardly to have realised that the Church in Scotland had obtained even mere toleration:—

'In journeying to Iona, Bishop Ewing made the acquaintance of the Rev. H. B. Wilson, of "Essays and Reviews" celebrity; and on the return voyage of the steamer the latter, forgetful or unaware at the time of the relation of the Episcopal Church of Scotland to the great majority of the population, stood up and proposed, at the crowded dinner-table, a toast that he was sure would be specially acceptable to all present, "The health of the Bishop of Argyll and the Isles." The English tourists on board were, of course, ready to drink the Bishop's health; but the words of Mr. Wilson called forth from the Scottish passengers expressions and looks of utter astonishment, which for a brief space threatened to convert the dining-saloon into an arena of ecclesiastical controversy; but in the end the good humour and good breeding of the majority of the voyagers prevailed.'—(p. 141.)

Besides this gentleman, whose zeal, it may perhaps be thought, outran, though very innocently and pardonably, his

discretion, we find other well-known names with whom the bishop delighted to surround himself. Dean Stanley was an *habitué* of the new church at Oban; with Mr. Jowett the bishop maintained a close friendship; and his biographer relates how Dr. Sumner, the Bishop of Winchester, who had 'come down to Oban rather disposed to regard the Church in Scotland as a very questionable daughter of the Reformation, with Laudian proclivities,' went back with 'an entirely new feeling of interest in the future of Episcopacy in Scotland,' and ever thereafter maintained 'a life-long intimacy' with the 'Highland chieftain,' who was then the Bishop of Argyll. This we presume to be one of the examples of the biographer's historical imagination; for, let a man have the dialectical skill and the gift of tongue of a Crichton, he could hardly produce such wondrous effects in a ten minutes' conversation.

It now, however, became abundantly clear that Bishop Ewing meant to take, or took without meaning, a line in the Scottish Church strictly analogous to that taken among ourselves by Dr. Stanley or Mr. Jowett. But, as the Poet Laureate says of another matter, he was

'Not like in like, but like in difference.'

He was broad enough in all conscience; but, as became his nationality, he was *broad with unction*. Other differences occur to us. His liberal views on religion were the outcome of far less culture and scholarship than those of his southern congeners, and, as a consequence, they were far less original. He took them up from time to time from one or another among more powerful thinkers; as, for example, Mr. Erskine, of Linlathen, of whom the bishop wrote in his impulsive way, and with a momentary forgetfulness of his usual good taste, 'he is the man of God, indeed, and with reverence I may say of him that he takes away the sins of the world from all who have the happiness of knowing him,' and to whom he wrote still more strongly:—

'Now as to your two letters, I cannot say what help and comfort they have been to me and others; for you know, my dear sir, I am but a medium for communicating your spirit rappings and sensations, a bank for issuing your notes. Stanley, Jowett, the Bishop of London, and the Bishop of Oxford (with the last of whom, *en route* here, I stayed three days last week), Miss Winkworth (who is here), and many others have read, and were all more or less benefited by them.

'It is a most charming place. I wish you were able to come, or I to go and see you. I owe you more, dear sir, than to any man alive: *I owe you belief in God—in God as my and our true friend and Father.*'

Mr. Campbell of Row, Mr. F. H. Myers, the author of *Catholic Thoughts*, may also be mentioned as sources from which he derived *what was peculiar* (which, after all, was not much) in his theology. So far as it was original, it appears to us to be the common-sense method of a mind rather receptive and intelligent than powerful, and for the most part ignorant of theology in the scientific sense. He did not, we fully believe, know what treasures of divine thought there are in the 'queen of sciences,' and would have been far more respectful to it had he known. He was so *good* a man, and so sincerely modest and deferential (as we have just seen) to those few men in whom he recognised the leaders of his mind, that it was a pity he allowed himself to adopt so violent a tone of partisanship, to use terms so disparaging and undignified in controversy as for example at the time of the Lambeth Conference; terms which stand now as an exception to his usual amiability and tolerance of disposition. His charge before his Diocesan Synod in 1860, also, belongs to this class of little-worthy utterances; indeed, the language which he uses in it about the Catholic view of the Holy Communion,¹ calling it 'an apparatus manipulated by a priestly caste, from contact with which alone eternal life was to be secured' (p. 304), and saying that, 'according to the materialistic conception of the Sacrament, the secret of Hamlet would be mastered by eating a bit of Shakspeare's body' (p. 305), seems to us simply horrible; and, considering the official character of the speaker, and the occasion upon which it was used, we cannot characterise it as it deserves without using strong language ourselves. His complete misunderstanding of the Catholic doctrine is evident enough. And he had a *feminine* kind of way of jumping to conclusions which was also characteristic.

Going back for the present to the point we had reached before our digression, we find the next noticeable point in the bishop's career to be the Gorham decision in 1850 on baptism, and the action taken thereon. It is true that this 'great liberating decision of the Privy Council,' as the present biographer calls it, had no legal authority in the Church of Scotland, as the bishops took care immediately to make known. But the body of the Scottish clergy were laudably anxious that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration should not be compromised. The effect of the decision of the State was to make the question an open one in England, as far as

¹ It was at the time of the Brechin and Cheyne trials for alleged unsound doctrine on this subject.

the Establishment was concerned. The Scottish clergy and most of the bishops were determined that it should not be so among them. A demonstration was immediately organised in support of the protest of Bishop Blomfield ; and an agitation arose for a fresh definition of doctrine, which Bishop Ewing did his best to stem. He disliked, as we know, dogmatic 'fettters' each and all. In this case he had the further ground for opposition that any fresh doctrinal decision would 'erect a fresh wall of partition between their own communion and that of the Church of England,' which he held, not without reason, would be a 'fatal blunder.' For there can be no doubt whatever, that, if the Church of *England* has suffered grievously from its isolation, the Church of Scotland has very nearly died from the same cause ; and that there is a real necessity that the smaller and the weaker community should seek in all respects, as far as is possible, to share the fortunes of its southern sister ; and to recruit with the lifeblood of a larger and richer organisation the energies which unpropitious circumstances, and a poverty far from fully deserved, have sometimes caused to flag. And such a connection is almost as advantageous to England as to Scotland. Any step, therefore, which would have had the effect of hindering this intercommunion in the very smallest degree would have been a mistake ; and it seems to us that their projected action would have been a mistake. It was eminently praiseworthy, and was prompted by the purest of motives ; but it was a mistake all the same ; and it was well, that, whether by Bishop Ewing or somebody else, it should be quietly shelved. Not that Bishop Ewing's plan of action seems to us in all respects admirable. His strategy was a little uncandid ; and that he disliked the Aberdeen resolutions, although he gave his adhesion to them, is evident enough. His object, he says, was '*to prevent a general Synod*, which would probably have undertaken to lay down some formula on baptism, which might have been the cause of severing our connection with the Church of England. To avert such a catastrophe, I went further than I had intended, as you will see ; but I could not set myself in opposition to the words of our formularies, and the resolutions are almost entirely based upon them.' Nor was there, if we are to take the following letter to his brother, as representing a deliberate view of doctrine, any reason why he should so set himself in opposition :—

'What I objected to in the Declaration was the Declaration itself ; for I did not see that we were called upon to take any action whatever in the matter, and I do not think that we are affected by

the Gorham decision. The Catholic Church has always held that some special benefit was attached to the due administration of the rite of baptism; and, so far, I am not prepared to dissent from 'the teaching of the Catholic Church, and take part with the Zuinglians.'—(p. 175.)

In short, he was altogether right here. Not so in the matter of the Scottish Communion Office, 'the Dagon of a Scottish office' as he called it. In this case, strong dislike of the doctrine which the Formulary was supposed to teach, combined with his wish to efface all marks of distinction between his own and the English Church, to make him its most bitter and persistent opponent; and we shall find him in later years making effort after effort to get rid of it.

At the present time his mind was full of another scheme, and one which could hardly have been entertained by any other bishop of the entire Anglican Communion. This was nothing else than to settle himself in Turin as a bishop *unattached*, and supply episcopal ministrations to the non-Catholic Vaudois—or as he puts it in a letter to his brother:—

'I think it not unlikely that a bishop representing the Church of England, and whose mission it would be to form a centre of unity for the descendants of the 'slaughtered saints' among the Vaudois, and for others who are claiming liberty of faith in Sardinia, would be acceptable in Turin. . . . This position for a year or two would suit me delightfully.'—(p. 227.)

Strange as it may seem, this preposterous scheme was a pet project of his, and one which he made great efforts to carry out, going so far as even to make a public appeal for funds. But after endless correspondence, the plan fell through the hands even of Bishop Ewing and his friends. Cooler thinkers pointed out that the *English* population of Turin was at all times small and essentially fluctuating in character, that there was little probability of the Italian Protestants caring for episcopal ministrations, and a *great* probability that the Italian Government would regard such a mission with marked jealousy and disfavour; if indeed they had not put a *veto* upon it altogether. In short, the thing *would not do*; this those persons who were in an authoritative position gave Bishop Ewing distinctly to understand, and its abandonment followed of course. It does not seem to have occurred to any one of those concerned, what an enormous and unprovoked breach of Church order and propriety it involved; for it would not have at all fallen under the

shelter of the principle upon which the Gibraltar bishopric was founded, upon British territory and for British subjects.¹

It was not surprising, considering the views which Dr. Ewing² held, that this should not have occurred to him in the least; and as a matter of personal choice to be made by himself, the scheme had much to recommend it. The climate of Scotland had been too severe for his always feeble and uncertain health. He 'talked with Bishop Trower about going as a missionary bishop to foreign parts' (for which, with his feeble health, he was most unfit), in order to live in a milder climate. Then the pecuniary responsibilities of his diocese (from which he had all this time but 270*l.* a year of income) were too heavy for his means. So he writes to his brother, his constant and confidential correspondent:—

'I am almost afraid of my ability to carry on the work of this Argyll bishopric. The expenses are very heavy, and the continual journeying is as laborious as if I were a bishop in New Zealand. I have not as yet obtained the income arising from the endowment of the see, and I have had to sacrifice no inconsiderable amount of my capital. If this kind of expense goes on, in the event of my being called out of the world, my children would be ill provided for. I have, therefore, been thinking of offering myself as a missionary bishop to our Church. Some years ago a proposal to send out such a missionary from the Scotch Church was mooted, but no definite action was taken in the matter. In fact, the project was reckoned premature. I have no doubt it would receive a more general support now, and might be carried through. I believe the Bishop of London would lend it all his influence, and our Church would give to the mission all she now contributes to the various missionary societies. Probably Australia or a Pacific island would be the spot or sphere chosen.'—(p. 189.)

However, all these various plans came to nothing; and at length he resolved to bear to the end the burden laid upon him in Scotland, and we hear thenceforth no more of projects for removal. But to the end of his life, we are told, so persistent is a fixed idea, he remained of opinion that in the Turin scheme a great opportunity had been missed.

We must pass over, without special notice, the bishop's efforts in furtherance of the Highland Emigration Fund, to relieve the widespread distress among the Highlanders,

¹ 'One of the Oxford authorities, while warning him against "the Waldensian heresy," said, greatly to his surprise, "You are surely far more needed in your own country, to proclaim there the Church's great message of the redemption of all mankind by Christ."—(p. 235.)

² We ought to have mentioned that he had received the honorary degree of D.C.L. from the University of Oxford in 1851.

caused by the failure of the potato crop, and go on to give some slight sketch, so far as it is narrated here, of Bishop Ewing's connection with the College at Cumbræ, the munificent foundation of the noble family of Boyle. The Church in Scotland has sometimes been accused of 'lairdism.' But if the 'lairds' were always willing to display a similar liberality to that shown during a long series of years, in the foundation and nurture of this college, the charge would become the highest title to honour of the laity of the Scottish Church; and specifically, the clergy would ere this have a less inadequate provision than the pittance which, in some dioceses, is to this day all they receive. As to Cumbræ, after being originally founded in 1849 by the present Lord Glasgow, then the Hon. G. F. Boyle, for the training of theological students to minister as clergy in the diocese of Argyll and the Isles only, it has gradually extended its scope until it is at the present time one of the two great feeders of a native ministry to the Scottish Church. To the same liberality it owes the imposing pile of collegiate buildings, of which the central portion is a noble cathedral church, occupying the island of the Little Cumbræ, in the Frith of Clyde, which is some three miles long by two broad.

The objects of this foundation were of a pious and Catholic kind, and the language of the statutes recalls those 'Ages of Faith' with whose noble benefactions this institution may of right be classed. Its intention was to further 'the worship and service of Almighty God, by daily prayer and frequent celebration of the Holy Communion.' There was to be a provost and three to six canons, and, besides being a theological college, it was to be a centre for clergy to be habitually engaged in mission work somewhere in the diocese; and the bishop was to be provost. Accordingly this noble gift, with a suitable endowment, was made over by the founder to trustees, representing the diocese of Argyll and the Isles, and solemnly accepted by the Synod which met at Lochgilphead in 1853, when a unanimous and well-deserved resolution of thanks was returned to the donor. The following year the bishop was himself installed as provost; and we find him writing to Lady Glasgow of 'the ceremonies of the installation, the splendour of the evening services, and the solemnity of those of the next day. . . . Our services in church and meetings for various purposes are really doing us all good.'

But these bright anticipations were too soon overclouded. The ritual and service at Cumbræ fell under what was, we

have no doubt, very unmerited suspicion. The bishop began to 'feel a difficulty in being officially connected with an institution which was generally regarded with extreme suspicion as a seminary established for the diffusion of anti-Reformation principles' (as they were then understood, it may be, in Scotland). In 1858, when the Declaration on the Eucharist was causing widespread strife throughout the Scottish Church, we find the bishop observing that it was 'hot at Cumbræ.' In fact, in the 1860 Synod of Argyll and the Isles, Mr. Cheyne's case was brought forward by Mr. Cazenove, Mr. Keigwin, and Mr. Mapleton, the first two being canons of Cumbræ, which thus espoused the condemned Eucharistic doctrine. An English visitor, a clergyman, observes on this:—

'Whether Cumbræ, with the tone of mind prevailing there, is a benefit to your brother's diocese, seems to me a question. Whether Episcopalians there look to their church as a means of sustaining their inner life, or whether they regard their ritual only as the expression of a high-caste religion, seems to me also a question. My complete ignorance of course suggests these questions; and I speak of them only as questions, and not as convictions. Mr. Boyle himself, beyond a doubt, looks to his Church in its best and highest sense.'—(p. 307.)

There was undoubtedly a wide divergence of opinion from the first, and it grew wider as years went on. The bishop was altogether out of harmony, not only with the authorities at Cumbræ, and with the religious and Catholic tone which the founder had with sedulous care impressed upon the place, but with the entire body of clerical opinion throughout the Scottish Church. And so, after holding the Provostship for thirteen years, though his connection with the college was not much more than nominal, it was felt by him too irksome to be borne, and he severed it. We are anticipating somewhat the course of events; but we shall complete our view of this episode in the bishop's career if we insert here the letter, dated 1866, in which the bishop expressed to the founder his resignation of the office of provost:—

'The fact of my having, in all probability, to be abroad for the next three or four months, induces me to come to a conclusion on a subject which I have long had on my mind, and which I feel ought no longer to be delayed—my resignation of the office of provost of the college. I need not say with what regret I have formed this resolution, but I feel that it is due both to you and to myself. I am of no active benefit to the college, and I feel that my spirit is not in unison with that which is most precious to you. You may feel quite sure that this resignation which I now make is prompted by no

greater divergence on matters of opinion than that which existed between us from the first. My acceptance of the office was prompted by the difficulty which existed at the time of finding a suitable head ; that difficulty does not now exist. No one, I conceive, could be found more suited for the post than your present excellent vice-provost, Mr. Cazenove, who has had so long experience of the work. In severing my nominal connection with the college, I hope I do not sever any real bonds between us. Believe me, I shall ever retain for you and yours a feeling of the deepest honour and friendship.'—(p. 457.)

It should not, however, be imagined that the Bishop's personal relations with the staff of the college were other than most kind and cordial throughout. The personal winningness and amiability which were remarkably characteristic of Bishop Ewing prevented the theological divergence ever hardening into a rupture of friendliness. And he more than once withstood attacks made by others upon the Institution. And when (we have been told) an alteration of the Canons of the Scottish Church appeared to discountenance the use of the simple vestments which had always been worn at Cumbrae, the Bishop, far from taking advantage of this to urge their discontinuance, said that he did not read so the new Canon and would be sorry to see the vestments discontinued.

When he had divested himself of *responsibility* for the College his kindly interest increased. He was in the habit of attending, whenever he could, the meetings of Chapter ; and it was, we are told, 'the dearest wish of his heart to see the Collegiate Church raised to the position of Cathedral of the Isles ; and on the last occasion when he was present in Chapter, he expressed himself strongly on this head. Owing to the peculiar circumstances of the College at that time, he was unable to see his wish realised, but the difficulties having at length been removed, one of the first steps taken by his successor was to carry out his wishes in this respect.'

In 1856 Mrs. Ewing died ; and the bishop, a man who was always, as we have seen, particularly home-loving and affectionate, was heart-broken. His letters at this time, though inexpressibly touching, breathe an utter depression and complete abandonment to sorrow, too absolute, we may say, or at all events very unusual for a man. He says himself in one of his letters, 'No *man* understands me—I fear I was intended to be feminine !' He felt acutely the deprivation of a helper the strength of whose character seems to have made up what was wanting in his own ; and some of the letters are so unreserved in their expressions of feeling, that we almost doubt

whether they should have been printed. A sorrow, so full and overshadowing, so almost bitter at times (p. 271), would naturally be peculiarly open to the beneficent influences of time. He grew calmer and more resigned after some years, and in 1862 he married, for the second time, Lady Alice Douglas, daughter of the Earl of Morton.

Meanwhile his work went on; and he was brought face to face with that subject which had already been, and continued still more to be, one of the great preoccupations of his life,—the doctrine of the Eucharist and the Scotch Communion office; for 1857 had seen the issue by Bishop Forbes of his famous charge on the doctrine of the Eucharist, which at once 'alarmed the Protestant feelings of many, both of the clergy and laity,' and was freely stigmatised as 'Romanising and materialistic'—terms of opprobrium, whose meaning it may be fairly questioned whether many of those who used them understood. An episcopal declaration which Bishop Ewing, after some hesitation, signed, condemning the Bishop of Brechin's views, proved insufficient to calm the storm; and a formal trial for unsound doctrine was resolved on.

The bishop's hesitation arose partly from his dislike to new 'definitions on the Eucharist,' and partly because he thought a more drastic measure was needful—the disuse of the Scotch office. He had long disliked it as 'Laudian,' and as an obstacle to 'identification in all points with the Church of England.' In his own diocese, he had, as far as he could, put an end to its use; and he would fain have done so universally. Now the time seemed favourable for an attempt. So he went into print with his 'letter to the Primus,' which he followed up by a motion (in the Synod that condemned Bishop Forbes) to depose the office from its position among the formularies of the Church; but even here he had *not one* supporter. Then came on the charge against Mr. Cheyne, and by this time Bishop Ewing was himself senior bishop,¹ and presided at Mr. Cheyne's trial, though without voting or taking any active part in the proceedings.

'In fact, he could not have spoken at all without seeming to affront the right reverend brethren by whom he was surrounded, for while agreeing with the majority of them in their beliefs as to the symbolic significance of the Holy Communion, and while he could not regard with indifference the blundering materialism of Mr. Cheyne, he deprecated from his inmost heart all doctrinal persecutions. He

¹ The Primus was just at this time laid aside by a stroke of paralysis.

shrank from "definitions of the undefinable," and, in the present instance, his rooted conviction was that the prosecution struck the wrong object. The sentence of indefinite suspension was pronounced by the Synod against Mr. Cheyne, but Bishop Ewing could not record his vote in favour of "a judgment involving penal consequences."—(p. 285.)

'Mr. Keble,' he writes immediately afterwards, 'was at the trial, and left to-day in very low spirits. We all thought Mr. Henderson too much for the Bishop of Brechin. As to the judgment itself, I should be prepared to move that we should not deliver any penal sentence, and chiefly on the ground of our sanctioning the use of an office for the Holy Communion which teaches we know not what. So long as that is used, similar troubles must and will arise.' He expressed sentiments strongly resembling this, besides entering fully in his usual *à priori* way into the doctrinal aspect of the question in his Charge this year (1860). For this he was (justly as we think) exposed to the reprehension of his brother bishops, one of whom told him that 'he deserved a presentment.'

The two following years were marked chiefly by the institution in London of an Argyll Episcopal Fund, which was very successful. By its success, the bishop was reimbursed some part of the great pecuniary advances he had made for his diocese, and may be said to have been freed from anxiety upon the subject for the future.

In 1862 and 1863 the Scottish Church was again convulsed with the question of the abolition of the Scottish Office, on which two successive meetings of Synod voted with varying results, the more decided course of entire abolition from the service of the Church not proving to be sustained by the feeling of the various Diocesan Synods, to whom, in accordance, we believe, with the constitution of the Scottish Church, it was submitted in the *interim*. Bishop Ewing was, of course, in the forefront of the abolition party. It was one of the great questions which he had made his own all through his career. But his success was only partial, notwithstanding that he had a great body of lay opinion at his back, and that a gradual modification of view had been proceeding among the bishops themselves. The Upper House in the Scottish Church is so small (only *six* bishops sat on this occasion), that when opinions are evenly balanced, a defection of *one vote* from either side decides a question; and that was precisely the issue on this occasion. A compromise, therefore, was arrived at, by which the English Prayer Book was to be ordinarily and generally used; but that each *new congregation*

might elect to use either the Scottish or the English Office in the Holy Communion. The bishop called this 'a great victory for the Scottish Office party,' which it certainly was not, unless it be a victory to avoid entire defeat; and looking to the circumstances of the case, we cannot but regard this compromise (which is still in force, and forms the rule of the Church) as a wise and statesmanlike course. So one of Bishop Ewing's great objects was at length partially attained; and although he protested, 'This synod has thrown back our Church twenty years. We have, I fear, done a very foolish or a very wrong thing. There was no feeling for the Scotch Office until the last fifteen years. It is altogether a Tractarian galvanisation;' yet he was well contented to let the matter rest, and have an end of it so far as he was concerned. In truth he saw and said that there was 'nothing else for him to do.' The matter had been fought out to the end, and there was no more to be said.

The 'Essays and Reviews' controversy was to the bishop as a storm looked upon from a safe distance, and it does not appear to have extended at all to the Scottish Church. We find abundant evidence in his letters, however, that he viewed it with the keenest interest. 'I would,' he says, when writing to Bishop Tait, 'be a Liberal as to the future, a Conservative as to the past, *i.e.*, tolerate Wilson and ask Stanley to leave the standards alone.' On this latter point he is emphatic; and there is a striking letter from him to the same prelate on the subject which is worth transcribing in part:—

'I am not, and I have not been, ever satisfied that much can be done at present in the way of alterations of subscriptions or standards. The questions now at issue are beyond solution by small amendments, and great ones none of us are prepared to make. I think that when such questions are in the field as "has God indeed spoken, and to what extent?" any move which does not relate to them is, in military language, changing our front in face of the enemy—an operation of great hazard. I do not think, moreover, that any great number of men whom it is desirable to satisfy would be satisfied by such alterations as we are prepared to make, and the others are not worthy of much consideration—not so much, at least, as removing landmarks for their sakes. I am, on the whole, inclined myself at present to an attitude of simple conservatism, believing that the only difficulties really pressing are not those which alteration of standards or subscriptions would satisfy. My own opinion is, that standards go a very little way towards the formation or maintenance of belief, and that this is pretty much formed and held apart from standards and is untouched by them, people throwing them off, perhaps, with violence when they oppress the conscience by their sanction of visible evils,

as at the time of the Reformation; but when they do not, sitting quietly under them, as if unconscious of them, or signing them merely as conventionalities. If the clergy could agree by memorial to their bishop upon what they would like done, I would gladly go along with them. I doubt if it is wise to go ahead of them, except in matters of faith. I look upon standards as a sort of property, which, without their own consent, I would not take from the clergy. Let us seek to alter opinion rather than change the standards. These must be changed (or will be) so soon as opinion is really formed and pressing. I doubt very much if it is so yet. I am sure that it is not so as to what changes are desirable.'—(p. 358.)

The question especially of future punishment was of intense interest to him, and he had strong views on the subject, which we find expressed in various letters *à propos* of the Wilson and Colenso cases. 'I think,' he writes to his brother, 'that the Bishop of Capetown has weakened his case by introducing so many counts in his indictment against Colenso; for by so doing he has censured views, that on future punishment among the number, on which Colenso has sympathisers.' And in the same letter: . . . 'Observe that Colenso was only killed on the head of every man, by Capetown firing off the Creed of S. Athanasius. Do not *you* fire that *Mons Meg*. It is a barbarous old piece, honeycombed, rusty, more dangerous to friends than foes.' To Bishop Wordsworth (of S. Andrew's), he says, 'I am against altering the standards, save S. Athanasius!'

To Bishop Tait again: 'Evil has nothing divine in it, and must end.' Such utterances show clearly enough in what direction his sympathies were tending, and what *he would have called* his doctrinal position was. Yet there is a pregnant utterance in a (somewhat questionable) letter to his brother some time before:—

'One sentence, however, before I close, on 'Eternal Judgment.' That expression, as I conceive, simply means *that we are always under unchanging laws*. It reminds us that God is *always* judging us, or rewarding us, 'according to our works,' ordaining for us that that which we sow we shall also reap. But whereas it is said that 'after death is the judgment,' I can only understand the words as conveying to us the intimation that the righteous judgments of God which are now always taking place, but which we do not always recognise, will at last be made manifest to the heart and conscience.'—(p. 319.)

Such utterances were the *intuitions* of the man, and show the manner of his inmost thought. But they do not seem to have been got by any deliberate reasoning process. They are utterly arbitrary and *à priori* in character. *Cogito*—not *ergo sum* but '*Cogito ergo credo*.' Owing, it may be to the some-

what slender outfit of theological knowledge upon which we have remarked before, the bishop was thrown back more than was good for himself or others upon this method ; and a very dangerous method it is for most men. Thus it was that his treatment of most questions, broadest of liberalising Churchmen though he was, was wanting in the *breadth* which a fuller study would have given to him. It proceeds invariably upon a single line of more or less valid inference, which was always liable to be upset by the fact that he was dealing with *one face* of the question only, and that fuller knowledge would probably modify the premises which he took for granted.

In 1864, he sojourned at Ems, and afterwards at Palermo and various Italian towns. From Sion, in the Valais, he writes to the Bishop of London, *à propos*, we suppose, of the movement for a new Court of Ecclesiastical Appeal :—

‘But now of Dr. Pusey and this movement, of which I see a lengthened account in the *Guardian* just sent me. He cannot do much harm, there is so much good in him ; but the Church of England would surely have been on the wrong tack (and he knows it), in a Catholic sense, if she had *defined* in the Gorham case, or any of those matters left undecided by the Privy Council. Dr. Pusey seems to think there is no belief if there is not definition of every thing seen in the Mount, even to the scarlet and blue edgings. In this age, when the conveyance of property is simplified, property is as much property as before. He is a religious botanist, with a large *hortus siccus*, and long dry names. Nevertheless, the poor and ignorant are saved, and although England may be hazy as to the Monophysite question, I think the mass of the English people are in a healthier state of mind than Dr. Newman.’—(p. 387.)

We may say once for all, about Bishop Ewing's letters, that they are among the most charming letters we have ever read—clear, pleasant, and with a bright lively touch for persons and things, which he puts not seldom in a new point of view. The writing of letters was a very congenial occupation to him, as the great number of them inserted in this memoir proves ; and it suited the light artillery of his mental equipment better than laboured disquisitions. A curious incident is recounted as having happened to him on this tour :—

‘At Bologna there was a service in the hotel, and the bishop came down to be among the worshippers. The service began by the officiating minister giving out a hymn, and then asking if there was any one among the congregation who could ‘raise the tune.’ As no one volunteered, Dr. Ewing himself led the music. It was not until the service was over that the bishop discovered that he for the nonce had been ‘precentor’ to a Wesleyan preacher.’—(p. 387.)

We find in these later years the bishop's aversion to dogma stronger than ever, and *now* we observe with regret some want of that kindliness of temper always observable in earlier years. He refused to concur in the approval expressed by the other Scottish Bishops, of the sentence on Bishop Colenso. 'Can I join in an excommunication,' he writes, 'because a man will not say that six times six is thirty-seven? Can excommunication alter a matter of fact?' and so on; which is painful to read. Against Bishop Gray, his cry was Law, law, law: the law of the Church of England as a State Establishment; and he looks no higher. One would suppose from his letters at this period, and on this subject, that he had never heard of the Church Catholic, or that he supposed it to have no existence out of England, or that it had no laws of its own. The Erastianism which had so got hold of him by this time is unintentionally illustrated by a passage in one of his letters to the Bishop of London, after the latter's serious illness:—

'Pray, my dear bishop and brother, keep yourself for these things. *Any one can do your ordinations and confirmations, and other such business*, but no one can take your place at the Privy Council, or in Parliament, or in Convocation. Pray tide over the summer anywhere out of London, and come and spend the winter with me in Italy. *I am quite serious. All your other work is nothing to that which you can do, and you only*, in the Privy Council in the years to come.'—(p. 447.)

Our readers will perhaps wonder that they have heard so little of Bishop Ewing's performance of similar duties to those he thus relegated to the second place; or of the administration of his diocese, and the progress of his people. But the fact is that we hear little of them after the first years of organisation, of keen energy and interest, and that they apparently ceased to be the chief business of his life. His Diocesan Synod consisted of twelve clergy, as far as we can gather; and his 'charges' were manifestoes, for the most part, to the world without, and not to the 'few sheep in the wilderness' within his pale.

With a few words on the description given here of the Pan-Anglican Conference, and of Bishop Ewing's attitude towards it, we must bring this review of his life to a conclusion.

What is said of the former must be considered to be the biographer's work; and it could not well be worse in taste and temper than it is. The one aim of the writer appears to be to *belittle* the Conference itself, and especially the colonial and foreign bishops, to deny their statements, to ridicule their

pretensions, and to represent the entire meeting as 'a conspiracy against Protestantism in the interests of sacerdotal dictation.' Of such words and of such a temper we cannot approve. Nor is Bishop Ewing's own language better. It needs hardly to be said that he was in the Extreme Left all through; he was averse to the action attempted to be taken about the Bishopric of Natal; he fully approved of the inexcusably discourteous refusal of Westminster Abbey for the closing service. But we had better quote entire what is represented to be the record of a conversation held between the bishop and some unnamed interlocutor immediately after the closing, which will speak for itself:—

"What," said the interrogator, "is your main feeling after the Conference?" "Relief, relief, relief."—"Was there any sense of solemnity at any part of the proceedings?" "Only the solemnity of being on board a ship that might blow up at any moment."—"Any possibility of thinking that it was an assembly in which the Spirit of God was at work?" "That depended on where I sat. When I was with the Bishop of Chester (Jacobson), yes; but when near, &c. &c., quite the reverse."—"What was your impression at the conversazione?" "It was like a scene from Hypatia."—"What is the worst thing that has been done?" "That the meeting has taken place at all. You will never get rid of it. They will always be clinging to it. They know that they have got fifty-six names which they can append to any document that they choose."—"What do you think of the pastoral letter?" "It is words, words, words, and nothing else. It was written by the Bishop of Oxford (Wilberforce), and very much shortened and cut down by the others. The Bishop of Winchester (Sumner), by one clean sweep, took out the whole viscera of a sentence in the Declaration on the Councils, and remained the hero of the field on the first day. We fought through it paragraph by paragraph, and by that evening reached the word primitive. Then the Bishop of Oxford proposed that the remainder of the sentence should be referred to a committee, which endeavoured on the next day to undo what had been done on the day before, but they were beaten."—"Great havoc made on the second and third days on the schemes for establishing ecclesiastical tribunals? A splendid speech from the Bishop of London (Tait), knocking them all to pieces. The Metropolitans were kept down by a masterly argument of Bishop Harold Browne. . . . The Natal Question was brought on at the very last moment by a kind of *ruse*. . . . One or two comical things took place. On the 28th, at Lambeth Church, the first lesson was Tobit ii. None of the American bishops would read it, so the Bishop of Lincoln (Jackson) did."—(p. 481.)

"I am not sorry that the battle of the Establishment (*in re* Colenso) was dropped. It never could have been fought on worse ground. For, consciously or unconsciously, the Bible was felt to be the question at stake, and all the Evangelicals, &c., were to a man with the

priestly party. Had not Dr. Pusey, by a strange infatuation, thrown over the Americans by his tract on the Scandinavian admission first, before the meeting at Lambeth (in which he sneered at the American Church as a whole), they also would as one man have joined the Metropolitans ! Happily the Americans' *amour propre* made them hang in the wind.'—(p. 486.)

After the Conference had separated, he wrote an article upon it, containing even stronger language, which several magazines declined to publish, and which its author at length put forth at his own expense in pamphlet form.

From this time his activity of mind took for the most part a literary direction. The 'Present Day Papers' which the bishop himself projected, and to which he contributed no less than eleven papers, besides editing the whole, served as the outlet for many of his most cherished ideas ; and the series ran to three volumes before it was discontinued. There is much in these volumes that is admirable ; and while they exhibit the characteristic faults of the writer's mode of thought, it would be unjust not to acknowledge that they show also much earnestness of thought, considerable charm of style, and an increased degree of spiritual insight. Thought is the best of educations ; and Dr. Ewing had now been a thinker for many years.

At this point, however (1871), we must bring to an end our long scrutiny of this interesting life ; a life which, however we may lament some incidents of it, was one of high aims, pure affections, and blameless tenour, not unworthy of a Christian bishop. Bishop Ewing passed away in 1873.

We are by no means certain that it is needful to say anything more by way of painting the moral of his career. That he had many winning and lovable qualities as a man, is perfectly clear ; and we have already pointed out the unselfishness and generosity with which he discharged the duties of his office. But the Episcopate is not a mere matter of routine to be worked by (as it were) turning a crank. It requires a clear undoubting belief in the spiritual powers of the office, and a strong and straightforward purpose, in order that the Episcopate may convey its full weight, and do the entire work for which it is intended. How far the subject of the present memoir came up to these requirements, we must leave it to our readers to determine.

Another point that occurs to us is, the demoralising tendency of ecclesiastical controversy, and that Bishop Ewing's career exemplifies it. Too often, it is to be feared, the *haute politique* of parties calls to its aid passions and tempers the

very reverse of spiritual; and we cannot but think that the hard, partisan tone of the Bishop's letters and public utterances in the later years of his life, so unlike the sweet persuasiveness of his earlier years, shows that this influence had told upon him for evil. He is not the first—we fear he will not be the last—to whom 'our unhappy divisions' have done harm. History repeats itself; and the embittered party-spirit and mutual repulsion which are caused by the wide divergence of belief, and still more of speculation, among us in this age recall nothing so forcibly as the factions of the Lower Empire, and the bitter comment of S. Gregory Nazianzen.

ART. VIII.—EARLY MSS. AND MINIATURES.

1. *Palæographia Sacra Pictoria*. By Prof. WESTWOOD.
2. *Miniatures and Ornaments of Anglo-Saxon and Irish MSS.* By Prof. WESTWOOD.
3. *Peintures des Manuscrits Français*. By Count BASTARD.

THESE works are on a magnificent scale of size and ornament, which appears to us to be one of the least of their merits. The first is, perhaps, the best introduction in existence to the study of different styles and periods of caligraphy; the second, an illustrated account of early Northern miniature work, only paralleled by Count Bastard's *Peintures des Manuscrits*. All of them have the great advantage of illustration by the hand of the author. The title of 'amateur' may be applied to them, because no professional workman either could or would do them. We believe we may mention that the late Sir Digby Wyatt resigned in despair the labour and eye-strain of copying the Irish spirals of the *Book of Kells*, which no precision or patience except Professor Westwood's could render; and everybody who can get at the books, and will try to follow only one interlaced pattern in any of the Celtic illustrations, will soon see that the backslider was not much to blame.¹ Nothing but specially trained hands and eyes could reproduce, and so make easily accessible to all students of art and history,

¹ The photographs published in the great work of the *National MSS. of Ireland* (by Government) fail in reproducing the more minute portions of the works.

the terrific intricacies of the Hibernian and Northumbrian scribehood. Critics are apt to forget, we think, that though, generally speaking, an amateur is not a professional artist, every professional ought to be an amateur, or lover of his subject and his work. So, in an important sense, ought every artisan to be too. The universal complaint in art and craft alike is that men do not care enough for their work to do it well, or put their hearts into it. And if we had to refer to art work which should be a standing testimony against half-hearted imperfection, and avaricious or fraudulent scamping, we should produce (along with much of Professor Ruskin's minute naturalism) the plates of these volumes.

The historical importance of the study of miniature is like that of any other branch of fine art. From the eighth to the tenth century it seems to be one of the best means of tracing the classical influence on Northern literature; because it shows what the mind of the Northern scribe was full of, what his imagination dwelt on and suggested to him, and what manner of man, in fact, he was. And from the date of the earliest existing MSS. of the decadence, their ornament and illustration, such as it is, is always an important means of following out the changing but imperishable effect of Græco-Roman art on the derivative styles, Byzantine or barbaric. There was a time when each of the arts in turn died out of practice in Italy, and indeed elsewhere: sculpture, fresco, and mosaic are no more, during the ninth and tenth centuries, except for some of the earliest and rudest of the Lombard bas-reliefs. For a long time nothing is left, we have no trace or record of art work, excepting the Evangelaries, Missals, and Psalters which the monasteries kept producing. These gave free scope to the spirit of the painter and the scribe, and in fact identified them. In the scriptoria copyists seem to have been raised, by honestly devotional zeal for their work, into the higher sphere of fine art. They did unquestionably believe the things they illustrated, and their intense interest in these gave them the greatest vigour of imagination, even in literal illustration to assist imperfect readers. This was the obvious use of the pictures to barbaric students. The miniatures not only adorned, but explained the text. Anyone who is beginning to read illuminated MSS. in various hands and of various periods will understand this well enough: he will feel how the pithy pictures express the meaning of the text and help him to decipher it. He will be able to enter into the mind of Alfred beginning his study of reading, or of Charlemagne turning his

sword-hand to attempts at illumination. Pictures have helped men to read in all times. These illustrations continued true art, because they kept alive the imagination, invention, and fancy of the monk painter. Having strained his thought to form the idea of what some great Scriptural event was like, and worked out his quaint conception of it as an imaginative reality,¹ he could let his fancy have its way for recreation, and ornament his borders and margins with any play of curve or colour he enjoyed. To a Saxon Englishman, taught his work in Rome or Ravenna, as many were, David, Asaph, and Heman may have seemed to have conducted Hebrew psalmody with the long Northern horn and psalter; as some such person has represented them in the Augustinian Psalter.²

Great things were possible for the race whose earliest workmen could produce the Psalter of Athelstan and the Alcuin Bible. The connection asserted by Prof. Westwood, and evident to most draughtsmen, between this work, Count Vivien's great Bible of Charles the Bald, and the Vatican Bible of S. Paul, is most important to every student of history, whether he cares for art or not.³

The great work of D'Agincourt, *Histoire des Monuments, &c.*, will give a sufficiently good idea, in scantily shaded outline, of the style of decorative painting, and even of finished pictures, to which the primitive ages were accustomed, and Mr. Parker's photographs have the additional importance of being exact renderings of original work in its present state. The 'Aldobrandini Wedding' (D'Ag., *Peint.*, xxvi.), with various Pompeian pictures, easily accessible in Gell's and Dyer's books, may give an idea of the highest form of first-century decoration. D'Agincourt (*Peinture*, pl. xxvi.) gives a capital illustration of the transition, or decadence, from the pretty Pompeian subject of the lady painter in her *atelier* to the

¹ Subjects in the great Cottonian copy of Ælfric's (d. 1006) *Heptateuch* (Claudius, b. iv.):—God upheld by angels in the oval Vesica Piscis; downfall of the rebel angels (devoured by a great red serpent); Creation, many subjects; expulsion from Paradise; translation of Enoch; the first rainbow; vineyard and winepress; Tower of Babel; Abraham and five kings (Abraham crowned, and clad in the ringed mail, or *byrn*, borrowed from the Phrygians—one of the earliest representations of this kind of armour); appearance of God to Abraham on a ladder and with angels; journey of Abraham and Isaac, and interrupted sacrifice; Lot and his wife led by angels; deception of Jacob; his dream; the Ark, &c. &c.

² See Westwood, *Anglo-Saxon and Irish MSS.*, plate iii., and *Pal. Sacra*, Psalter of S. Augustine.

³ See Count Bastard's *Peintures des Manuscrits*, vol. ii., and *Palæographia Sacra*, sub nominibus.

meritorious but awkward representation, in the Vienna MS. of Dioscorides (sixth century), of a naturalist painter illustrating the book and depicting a root of mandragora, which invention or nature holds up for him.¹ This MS. was written for the Empress Juliana Anicia (early sixth century), and contains her portrait, with many illustrative drawings of plants and animals. But there is something to be said first about classical books in their cheaper and more popular forms.

Though illustrated books certainly existed in ancient Rome, they do not seem to have been very numerous, and this essay may begin with an important observation of Prof. Milligan's² that books in Augustan Rome were much cheaper and more numerous in a humble form than the surviving relics of MS. would lead us to believe.

'We are apt to think,' he says, 'that the precious MSS. of sacred or classical literature which now adorn the great libraries of Europe, with all their elaborate ornamentation, are but specimens of all ordinary book-making previous to the date at which the art of printing was invented. We forget that not one common copy of even far later times than those of our earliest MSS. survives. All have perished—perished from the frailty of the material on which they were written, from their very slightness, their cheapness, their adaptation to the multitude. The great Codices—the Sinaitic, the Vatican, the Alexandrine, and others—do not give us the slightest idea of a MS. intended for the mass of men. . . . Numerous allusions in the Roman writers about the beginning of the Christian era leave no doubt that books were then multiplied with a speed, sold with a cheapness, purchased with an avidity, and sold throughout the whole Roman world to an extent almost incredible.'

He refers to Dr. W. Adolph Schmidt's *Geschichte der Denk- und Glaubens-Freiheit*, and goes on to explain that the MSS. were multiplied by the use of slave labour and the habit of dictation—a hundred trained slaves, perhaps, acting as scribes at once:—'A single bookselling firm at Rome could produce without difficulty, in a day of ten working hours, an edition of one thousand copies of Martial, book ii.; and a somewhat similar work, plainly bound, if sold for sixpence, left the bookseller a profit of 100 per cent.'³

This has an important bearing on a right estimate of the literary character of the age in question. But all these

¹ See *Palaographia Sacra*, p. xiii.

² The 'Early Christian Age,' *Contemporary Review*, vol. x. p. 590.

³ Schmidt, pp. 131, 137. S. Columba copied out his great Evangelium in twelve days with his own hand; this must exclude the illuminations.

slighter works have vanished, and it is only from the fifth or sixth century that more valuable and durable books remain to us.

Earlier than the *Dioscorides*, however, is the Vienna *Codex Geneseos*, with forty-eight miniatures. D'Agincourt places it in the fourth or fifth century. It is on purple, and the pictures are well and classically composed, though they show traces of the habit of crowding in figures, or heads, which is observable in Trajan's Column, as in the mosaics of Sta. Maria Maggiore 230 years after.¹ But, as in the last work, there is a graphic zeal for the facts, which is observable in the finest Byzantine and Gothic compositions. The Garden of Eden is decoratively treated, but with well-drawn figures. Rebekah and Eliezer are particularly interesting, with very well-drawn camels, and a Greek nymph at the fountain or well; and the history of Jacob and Esau, with the burial of Jacob in the Cave of Machpelah, are very meritorious.

Of the two Vatican *Virgils* (both probably sixth century) one has returned, we believe, to Paris. They are illustrated by D'Agincourt (*Peint.*, xx.-xxvi. lxiii. lxv.) He considers the latter as of the twelfth century, from its rudeness; but the writing is fine rustic Roman, and it has important relations to the other Virgil in its drawing. The caves in both are alike, all the eyes in both goggle similarly, and the originality and goodwill of the artist are very similar. Dido's Amazonian pelta and the evidently Barb character of the horses in the Paris MS. are features far beyond a twelfth-century scribe. These pictures, too, are all rectangular, not at all combined with the writing, which would probably have been attempted at the later date.

The legitimate use of imagination in realising your idea of great truths, in order to set them forth to others, was at full liberty in the monasteries; and the way to the Teutonic schools of religious painting was prepared by the succession of earlier monk artists, who preached the Scriptures in form and colour. One can see the pithy daring of the miniaturists repeated by Giotto; and in Italy this progress is distinctly traceable through him to Orcagna and the Siennese school; and into the life of Angelico, who began with Missal-painting. Some steps of it, at least, were made in the Cisalpine schools, though they were, perhaps, diverted into glass-painting, or were again turned towards sculpture.

¹ There is a curious and interesting comparison of these works by M. Vilet in Parker's *Mosaics*, and by D'Agincourt, *planches* xiv. xv., *Peinture*, vol. v.

The work of the scribe was held to be great and glorious by reason of his subject. To him the text was hallowed, and his feeling at his work was strictly that of the sacred artist. Dom Guéranger¹ dwells with justice on the devoted care with which the holy books were transcribed and edited in early days. The MSS., when completed in the scriptoria, were corrected under the care of bishops and abbots, who either entrusted that duty to competent hands or executed it themselves. The copyists would have thought it sacrilege to depart in any degree from the words given them to reproduce. So it was till the time of Charlemagne; and he began a season of special exertion and splendour in multiplying and adorning Evangeliaries, Psalters, and Sacramentaries, which were often destined for presents to his bishops for the use of their dioceses.² There can be no doubt of the effect produced in the true master-minds of the time by the lovely ornament, and sometimes the powerful realisations of event, which are found in the great MSS. of early years. Mr. Macaulay's contempt for them is amusingly expressed in his Essay on Byron. The historian and his party were unfortunately unable to endure the notion of monks of the past, or clergy of the present time, doing anything right; but Alfred and Charlemagne in their day thought very differently. It is hard to say what importance may, or may not, have attached to Mr. Macaulay's opinions about pictures or sculpture; but in this instance he failed to allow for the intellectual habits of a time far removed from the periods he had himself realised. At all events, the two first and best men in Europe of the eighth century thought MS. illumination of consequence enough to want to learn the art themselves, in the midst of wars involving personal combat for life, and negotiations on which the fate of nations and Churches depended. There is no reason to doubt the story that Alfred received help in the pursuit of knowledge, if he was not induced to learn to read, by the ornamented letters of a MS.;³ and Charlemagne's devotion to the subject induced him to practise caligraphy and illumination rather unsuccessfully with his own hand, says Eginhard. 'Tentabat et scribere, tabulasque et codicillos ad hoc in lectulo sub cervicalibus circumferre solebat, ut cum

¹ *Institutions Liturgiques*, vol. iii.

² Kräger, *De Liturg.*, p. 224; Capitulare, 62, l. i. Caroli M. Imperatoris ita statuit, 'Pueros vestros non sinatis eos vel legendo vel scribendo corrumpere; et si opus est, Evangelium vel Psalterum et Missale scribere, perfectæ ætatis homines scribant cum omni diligentia.'

³ Asser, pp. 7-8, ed. Walsingham.

vacuum tempus esset, manum effingendis literis assuefaceret. Sed parum prosperè successit labor præposterus et serò inchoatus.' It is more important than the Emperor's personal success that he should have so well understood the power of picture symbols to impress truth and convey instruction; as the ecclesiastical body had for centuries made a more dubious use of art to excite emotional devotion.

Before we go further, it may be as well to explain one or two terms. The word *illuminator*, *enlumineur*, does not belong to an earlier period than the end of the twelfth century. It marks a new period of renaissance, when the painters had begun the study of natural beauty, in the animal and vegetable kingdom more particularly. Their work consisted in beautiful studies of flowers, birds, and insects, used as ornament and in pattern, no doubt, but carried further as imitation of nature than in the preceding ages. Again, calligraphy is elegance or splendour of *writing*, and miniature means, in the first instance, pictures arbitrarily let into the writing. The derivation of the word is from *minium*, or red lead, which was always the first and principal pigment used to enliven black and white writing. In some instances, as in the purple or azure MSS., the letters were entirely in gold or silver, and were ornament enough without pictures; though purple MSS. with miniatures are to be found, as that in the Remonstrants' Convent at Prague, and one of the eleventh century in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. With these we are not concerned. They are a part of the fruitless pomp of the decaying Empire of Rome, and have nothing to do with the Greek inheritance of true beauty. The first on record, a purple MS. of Homer, is said by Guéranger¹ to have been presented to Maximin the younger by his mother, and the use of such books seems to go back to the comparatively early days of the Empire, shortly before the triumph of the Christian faith. But the distinction still remains, whether the pictures or miniatures form a part of the writing or are only attached to it, and inserted in squares or oblongs wherever their proper place may be, without having the text worked about them so as to combine the writing and pictures into one effect of the whole page. The text and its pictures are united, in all Gothic writings, by the use of grandly ornamented capital letters. Perhaps only one modern artist may be said to have revived this idea of the old calligraphers in an original way, though with exact analogy. The illustrations and ornamental writing of

¹ Jul. Capitolinus in *Maximinum*.

many of Blake's poems, copied and executed by his own hand, repeat that excellent moderation of the old scribes, who made their pictorial ornament most beautiful indeed, but always subsidiary to their caligraphy. The pictures were pretty, they thought, whereas the text was sacred; but even because the latter was chief, and the one thing needful, too much attention could not possibly be given to the former; and in the very earliest MSS., as the *Alexandrine*, ornament in coloured inks is freely introduced. The East was, of course, in advance of the West. Guéranger goes back no further than the seventh century for the first employment of artistic design by the liturgical caligraphists of the Latin Church. They began, naturally, with their initial letters, making the writing and illustration minister equally to the effect of the whole page. In the earlier Eastern MSS., as has been said, the illustrations are independent of the writing.

This was one obvious way of ornament, and another was nearly as inviting. The Canons of Eusebius were very early added to the Sacred Text, as in the *Rabula MSS.* (589 A.D.) (where luxuriant ornament is added to the columns and spaces) and in the *Evangelium of Ulfilas*, written, it is supposed, nearly at the same period. The idea of ornamental pillars to separate a calendar may have been derived from the fronts of ancient sarcophagi; at all events rows of parallel columns and arcades, with wreaths, scrolls, flower-work, and birds among their traceries, were a natural and pleasing kind of decoration. The seventh-century *Evangelium* named after Colbert (*Bastard*, vol. i.) has its columns drawn firmly and beautifully with the pen; and it is most interesting to any true draughtsman, in an age of mechanical copying, to observe the extraordinary skill which steady conscientious practice gave the scribe in this and other MSS. It seems to raise the ancient caligraphy quite to the dignity of fine art. The *O of Giotto* was doubtless a fair test of his great executive power, but it is excelled in difficulty and interest by these free pen-drawn birds and grotesques. It is singular that the last reminiscence of the vanished art should still be the swans or birds of the modern writing-master's flourish.

One or two pathetic examples of commendatory paragraphs by copyists may be added here from Guéranger. They have nothing to do with our main subject; nevertheless it may interest the reader to compare them with the earliest inscription of the kind on record—the quiet greeting of S. Paul's secretary—'I, Tertius, who wrote this epistle, salute you.'

From a Greek Evangeliary (eleventh century) :—

'This book has been written by the hand of a sinner. May the most holy Mother of God, and S. Eutychius, vouchsafe to accept its homage; and may the Lord God, by intercession of the most holy Mother of God and S. Eutychius, grant us eternal life in heaven. Amen.'

From the Missal of S. Maur des Fossés :—

'This book belongs to S. Mary and S. Peter, of the Monastery of the Trenches. He who shall have stolen it, or sold it, or in any manner withdrawn it from this place, or he who shall have been its buyer, may he be for ever in the company of Judas, Pilate, and Caiaphas. Amen, amen. Fiat, fiat.

'Brother Robert Gualensis [of Wales?] being yet young and a Levite, hath devoutly written it for his soul's health, in the time of Louis [le Gros], King of the Franks, and of Ascelin, abbot of this place. Richard, prior and monk, caused this book to be copied, in order to deserve the heavenly and blessed country. Thou, O priest, who ministerest before the Lord, be mindful of him. Pater noster.'

The distinguished caligraphists of the ninth-century Evangeliary of S. Emmeran, at Ratisbon, must have been fair scholars; but their names—Berenger and Luther—are somewhat ominous.

'Bis quadringenti volitant et septuaginta
Anni, quo Deus est Virgine natus Homo.
Ter denis annis Karolus regnabat et uno,
Cum codex actus illius imperio.
Hactenus undosum calamo descriptissimus æquor :
Littoris ad finem nostra carina manet.
Sanguine nos uno patris matrisque creati
Atque sacerdotis servit uterque gradum.
En Berengarius, Leuthardus nomine dicti,
Queis fuerat sudor, difficilisque nimis.
Hic tibimet, lector, succedant verba precantis,
Ut dicas, capiant regna beata poli.'

MABILLON, *Iter Germanicum*, p. 53.

But all these epigraphs yield to the intense interest of the initial and final writing of the *Book of Durrow*; or, *Gospel of S. Columba*, in Trin. Coll., Dublin.

On the fly-leaf of the MS. itself—

'Liber autem hic scriptus est a manu ipsius B. Columbkille per spatium 12 dierum an. 500.'

At the end—

'Rogo beatitudinem tuam, sancte presbyter Patrice, ut quicumque hunc libellum manu tenuerit meminerit Columbæ scriptoris, qui hoc

scripsi ipsemet evangelium per xii. dierum spatium, gratia Domini nostri.'

Below, in a contemporary hand —

'Ora pro me, frater mi : Dominus tecum sit.'

The name of S. Columba may lead us to consider the necessary allowances for Northern subject, and quasi-barbaric pattern and colour, as introduced in English or Scoto-Irish MSS. We do not mean by the word 'barbaric,' 'ugly' or 'offensive;' it is only applied here to work which has originated in the natural tastes or associations of Teutonic or Northern scribes, and not come to them through the Græco-Roman medium East or West, Byzantine or Roman. English interlacings and Irish spirals are not traditional or taught ornament; they are the special fancies of a race. Nevertheless there always was a great inheritance of traditional form, pattern, subject, and treatment in MS. ornament; and it is especially noticeable in the MSS. mentioned at p. 2. There may be added to them that interesting and provoking subject of polemical interest the Utrecht Psalter, which almost unquestionably belongs, by the way, to our own Cottonian collection, however it came into the hands of its present holders. Whoever may be the scribe or scribes of that singular work, there can be no doubt that one or more of them had seen Rome and Italy, and some of the classical subjects in it are here given from Professor Westwood's list, duly verified by ourselves:—A circular temple and oblong basilica, in the frontispiece, 1; ditto, Ps. li. *ad fin.* and Ps. lxviii.; temple, signs of the zodiac, sun, and moon, Ps. lxviii.; Atlas, Ps. lxxxii., with the Hebrew temple as an oblong peristyle; river-gods, or tritons, blowing long trumpets, Ps. xcii.; boats, with steering-oars, and tiled buildings, *passim*.¹ Angles and Gaels, Franks and Lombards, learnt from Old Greece through Rome the ornamentation of their houses, their temples, their books, and their furniture. Often they fell short of the beauty that had been; in some qualities they sometimes excelled it; the standard they have reached is a matter of dispute in some cases. One authority calls the vine of Torcello badly imitated from the Corinthian, and we strongly demur to the word 'badly.' But, whether it be a good vine or not, it is Greek. You may not like the Torcello acanthus, but it is Greek. No human ingenuity can alter the Greek forms of bell or lily capital; and however a man may conventionalise nature, still

¹ *Anglo-Saxon and Irish MSS.*

if he looks to nature he will be working like an Athenian so far, though he produce nothing less stiffly decorative than the vines or olives of S. Mark's. This is the technical inheritance, conveyed northward through Italy.

Then, there is this in the spirit or principles of the old and the new Greeks—that the art in the possession of the latter is once more religious, as in Phidian days; not only intellectual or imaginative, and so spiritual, but a part of religion, of defined and organised service of God. Phidias ignorantly worshipped the divine wisdom of Athene; Methodius may have had difficulty in drawing near to Christ, the Son of God. There is infinite distinction and difference between their Liturgy or Service; but both used their art in liturgy. Phidias lived in national glory and sense of power, which extended itself to every citizen of Athens; Methodius was a Greek monk to whom the world, and all in it, were only worth what they would fetch him in the world to come. Consequently Phidias looked on Nature with delight and awe, Methodius did not trouble himself about her any more than S. Bernard; Phidias carved the birth of Athene under Pericles, and Methodius executed the Last Judgment for Bogoris of Bulgaria.

The names of Methodius and his brother Cyrillus are, like those of other true workers, known only by their work. They represent the conversion of Bulgaria and Bohemia to some reality of Christianity, not utterly dependent on the Court of Rome. They were certainly the apostles of the Slavonic race, being Greek monk painters,¹ and probably of those who kept up the reputation of the Schola Græca at Rome. Like Theodore of Tarsus before him, Methodius seems to have been one of those zealous servants of the Eastern Church who supplied the energies and veiled the corruptions of the darkest centuries of the Western. He came in contact with races whose language he could hardly understand. He is said to have joined Cyrillus in inventing the Slavonian alphabet; and if that be so (there is no reason to dispute it) the adoption, by a race, of a phonetic language of letter symbols, along with painting, as symbolic of things and ideas, is very remarkable indeed. Ulfilas had been a 'wulfling' of Goths among Goths, and probably embalmed the letters of his race in his version of the Bible.² Pauli-

¹ Methodius was certainly born at Thessalonica.

² The *Codex Argenteus* (so called from its far-famed silver binding), now in the library of the University of Upsal, is one of the most renowned MSS. of the world. The singular discovery was made by three coun-

nus of Nola had had the easier task of instructing the wild converts of the middle Apennine by paintings and ornament; and, to go back to the very origin of the Christian faith in Rome, the earliest Greek- or Hebrew-speaking disciples must have had no slight difficulties to contend with in preaching to and catechising Latins. It seems possible, accordingly, that some ground truths of history and doctrine from the Old and New Testaments may have been embodied in symbols, and painted in the catacombs in the earliest days. But the painter Methodius seems to have arisen in a time of depravity and distress, when Mohammedanism was gaining fast on Christianity in the East, to form new outworks, and indeed new realms, for the faith. His life extends over the ninth century.¹ The terror and splendour of the great Carolingian power in Western Europe no doubt assisted him in his labours eastward, or perhaps the whole energies of the Eastern Churches were driven inward from Asia to his help; at all events his work lasted longer than the Empire of the Karlings, and must have given proof of its value by enduring the terrors of the later ninth century. Whatever tone of contempt, regret, or respect we choose to assume for the Empire and Church of the East, the latter endured and endures, through the despair of that age and the ruin of 1453, and later times.

The Carolingian Empire ended with the unworthy rule of Charles the Fat in 888.²

‘That time was, indeed, the nadir of order and civilisation. From all sides the torrent of barbarism which Charles the Great had stemmed was rushing down upon his empire. The Saracen wasted the Mediterranean coasts and sacked Rome itself. The Dane and Norseman swept the Atlantic and the North Sea, and pierced France and Germany by their rivers, burning, slaying, carrying into captivity; pouring through the Straits of Gibraltar, they fell upon Provence and Italy. By land, while Wends and Czechs and Obotrites threw off the German yoke and threatened the borders, the wild bands, pressing in from the steppes of the Caspian, dashed over Germany like the flying spray of a new wave of barbarians, and carried the terror of their battle-axes to the Apennines and the sea. Under such

pillors and professors that the letters in it have been produced, not by writing, but by some kind of stencilling process—an early approach to the art of printing. Found in the sixteenth century in the monastery of Werden; became the property of the University of Upsal about 1655. Purple, with gold and silver; letters of fine uncial form.

¹ See ‘Slavonic Biblical MSS.,’ *Palæog. Sacra*, for Cyrillian character and illumination. The former was originally Greek; now modified into Russian.

² See Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*, p. 87.

strokes the already loosened fabric swiftly dissolved. No one thought of common defence or wide organisation. The strong built castles; the weak became their bondsmen, or took shelter under the cowl: the governor, court, abbot, or bishop tightened his grasp, turned a delegated into an independent, a personal into a territorial authority, and hardly owned a distant and feeble suzerain. The grand vision of a universal Christian Empire was utterly lost amid the isolation, the antagonism, the increasing localisation of all powers; it might seem but a passing gleam from an older and better world.'

The Western Empire, in fact, which had divided Christendom, fell to pieces itself; Leo and Charlemagne, 'the Senate and people of Rome,' had tried to undo the change of Constantine, and had re-established the division of Valentinian. The Eastern Empire was to fall, but not yet; at present it was the central Christian power, and protected its own frontiers—through the fierce converts, for whom Methodius, it is said, would not translate the wars of the Kings of Israel, for fear their love of battle should be nourished by the histories of Joshua and David.

As to the Ruthenian or Slavonic and Bulgarian MSS. we possess, it can only be said, that whatever traces of skill they possess are Byzantine; and that they often show the severity of the ascetic engrafted on the ferocity of the savage warrior, and possess great force of animal character. But they are rude and few, and seem to have little to do with us at present. And we must here take leave of the ascetic Byzantine scribes of Athos and S. Saba and Mount Sinai, choosing from their scattered archives one great and typical example of the highest art-work of Eastern Christianity—the matchless and priceless MS. of Rabula, a monk of the Syrian convent of Zagba about A.D. 580.

It is necessary, and it is natural, in elementary study and teaching about ancient and mediæval art, to lose sight of the connecting transitions from the one to the other, and to insist chiefly on differences. People must know what is Gothic and what is Greek before they think of taking a view of progress from Greek to Gothic. But then most students stop at the distinctions, and never understand the connecting kinship. They know that the temple is horizontal and the cathedral vertical, but they do not follow the conversion of the Attic temple into the Roman basilica, or the Roman-Christian change from the entablatures to arcades, and the Northern change from round arcades to pointed. They think Gothic ornament so entirely different a thing from Greek that Goths cannot have learnt any of it from Greeks. This is more

excusable in England, where the classical impression is undoubtedly much feebler, and where the thoughts go back less willingly to the ancient lessons of Greece and Rome, because Rome is their reservoir, if not their fountain. But it is an important thing to preserve the continuity of history; and to see the real though distant effects of ancient civilisations on more recent ones: the whole history of the Renaissance, in fact, turns on inherited tradition of art and knowledge, which is not yet fully traced. And so many links of it are to be found in MS. ornament that we make no further apology for mentioning once more some special examples of illuminated works from different parts of the world, which seem to prove the Græco-Roman or classical connection North, South, East, and West.

We fully agree with Prof. Westwood that the Bible of S. Paul's fuori le Mura in the Vatican,¹ the great Bible of Charles the Bald, presented to him by Count Vivien and now in the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Alcuin Bible in the British Museum, and the Augustinian Psalter described in *Palæographia Sacra*, have a classical element in common. He also notices elsewhere the great resemblances borne by the early Vatican *Virgil* and the MS. of Rabula² (which, as has been said, is in some respects the most interesting of all) to these and other Northern works. It shows what we know perfectly well, that Anglo-Saxons and Franks learnt much design at Rome and from Rome, and that Syrian monks got instruction from her and through her also, though they may not have visited her as the Northern pilgrims did. The Græco-Roman or classical element is common to them all, and forms a great part of their style. It may still be called

¹ Ninth century. D'Agincourt, *Peinture*, vol. v. planches xl.-xlv.

² In the Laurentian Library at Florence. I have alluded to the similarity between the ornaments of the ancient Syriac MS. of Rabula and the most ancient Anglo-Saxon MSS., and may here add that 'the very peculiar and common pattern found in Irish or Anglo-Saxon MSS., formed of several spiral lines united in the centre of the circle, with the ends dilated, is evidently identical, on a smaller scale, with the pattern employed by the artist of the "Miracle of the Pool of Bethesda" to represent the waves of the pool. These apparently trifling circumstances seem to prove, more forcibly than the most laborious arguments, the connection between the early Christians in these islands and those of the East—so strongly insisted on by various writers.'

The form of the waves in the pool (in *Pal. Sacra*, plate vi.) seems to me that of the Greek volute, doubtless common to Syrian and to Saxon after the seventh century; but there can be no doubt about the Eastern element in the English work. Eastern ascetic expression was, in fact, cosmopolite, and all monastic faces wore it more or less.

Græco-Roman; for such conventional grace, such study of nature as they have, is Greek-taught; but there certainly is not much of the latter quality, and beauty departs from all the figures accordingly. The eyes goggle universally. It seems that no artist, monk or other, had cared, from generation to generation, to look at his neighbour's eye and see that its pupil was half hidden between the lids. Kings and archbishops sit on curule chairs in Carolingian MSS., as in the bas-reliefs of ancient days; but the inference is forced on us that the artist did not even claim the license allowed—possibly through all ages—to the domestic cat; and never looked at the king or his chair, but was content to record the conventional protrusion of his knees, elbows, and feet, without even seeing what he was like. Vegetation is often introduced, but it is generally conventional without order, and unnatural without pattern. The dark age of Roman ornament, in fact, like the end of the Irish school of MS., is distinguished by general neglect of nature. The time was coming when in such works as the *Sacramentaire de Gellone*, and parts of MSS. already mentioned, new life of study should begin. But still, through all these works, that extraordinary element of the human soul called character, or power, recurs in its fitful, unmistakable way. It makes us understand that a man whom we might have admired and learnt from passed the desert before us at such a time, and was in his time a master capable of awing others, or guiding them, or of expressing their thoughts for them, or even of grotesquely amusing them. Few results so much as the last can have been attained by the later Vatican *Virgil*, which D'Agincourt evidently errs in placing so late as the eleventh century. The storm in the sixth book of the *Æneid*, with Dido and Æneas, is happily represented in *Peinture*, pl. lxiv., and we wish we could place a copy of this irresistible performance before our readers. Dido's evidently principal share in the love-making, her Amazonian pelta, the prudent attendant who has turned his round shield into an umbrella, the cheerful composure of the other in the Phrygian cap, and the hydraulic fury of the rain—are altogether beyond praise. This MS., as we have noticed, is much more like fifteenth than twelfth-century work; and the admittedly early *Virgil* of the Vatican, which D'Agincourt illustrates (*Peinture*, pl. xx.-xxv.), is of the same school.

Very different and yet very like these works is the MS. of Rabula (586 A.D.) Its Crucifixion¹ is the earliest known

¹ Figured in Rohault de Fleury's *L'Evangile*, and in the frontispiece of Tyrwhitt's *Art-Teaching in the Primitive Church*. S.P.C.K., 1874.

representation of the death of our Lord ; and is distinguished from almost all others by the fact that the soldiers are represented, not as casting dice, but as playing at *mora* on their fingers for the coat without seam. But yet more interesting is the 'Chariot of the Ascension,'¹ which connects, with evident intention, the vision of Ezekiel i. with the *Zōa*, or beasts, of the Apocalypse ; and also with all the *imagines clypeate*, and later 'Glories of Angels,' represented as upbearing the Lord on His chariot.

It is well worth the time and trouble, for anyone who has the opportunity, to compare, through D'Agincourt, Prof. Westwood, or otherwise, one, two, or more of these MSS. with each other, representing, as they do, the earliest Eastern, Carolingian, and English work. Whoever will do this will get an idea of the difficulty of determining what age and school a MS. really belongs to. They prove at a glance, if nothing else proved it, that the art of old Rome, derived from ancient Greece, is the substratum of all these works, whether in its classical or Byzantine form. Except the Irish school, and so much of it as survived in the Northern English, all seems to come from the same source. Calligraphy and miniature painting were always taught through religious houses or persons ; and hence in all these MSS. there is that cosmopolitan style of world-renouncing men, formed on the pilgrimage and in the monastery, which makes Rabula like Columba, or the English draughtsman of David, and both of them like Count Vivien. Just in the same way the Eastern Greek or Byzantine prevails alike in the Ruthenian, Bulgarian, and Oriental work, and crosses us again through the Greek school of painting in Rome, in Western mosaics and other documents ; connected, perhaps, with Theodore of Tarsus and other Greek evangelists of Rome. In their barbarised state the two styles are hardly distinguishable, as in the far-famed Diptych of Rambona.² It is not easy, and hardly necessary, to say whether they are Byzantine or Roman. The dark ages certainly obscure the traces of the Attic teaching ; but Rome had communicated much of it to the world, and in Rome it had been charged with a mighty message to the Western nations ; for through her wide rule or wider memories the moderns were to have access to the language of the graphic

¹ Figured by D'Agincourt (*Peint.*, pl. xxvii.), also in the late Mr. Wharton Marriott's *Worship of the Blessed Virgin*, and by Tyrwhitt (*Art-Teaching*, &c.)

² Figured in Smith's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, s.v. 'Crucifix.'

arts—and far more than that, to the language of the New Testament.

One school of ornament there was, however, of which some brief sketch is necessary, though it stood apart from all others, since its relics to this day command an admiration due to, perhaps, no other; and are, at all events, most singular and interesting. The early achievements of the Irish scribes and draughtsmen can hardly be appreciated except by readers of Prof. Westwood's works, or by the use of his numerous books of reference; which, in fact, requires the neighbourhood of a large library.

The origin of the Irish Church, and its relation to those on the Continent, has long been the subject of enquiry and dispute. Perhaps one side may have been more inclined to prove the Church by MSS. than the MSS. by the Church, and the other to ignore any Christianity not traceable to Rome. But it is not directly denied that there was an Irish, Scottish, or Celtic Church before Augustine came to England (the name Scot meaning Irishman in early ecclesiastical record, in which sense it was applied to Erigena). On this matter we have duly verified two passages from Chrysostom and Tertullian, which seem important and almost decisive; and for the rest we may refer to the more recent, but on main issues conclusive, testimony of Mr. Green.¹

¹ Green's *History of the English People*, ch. iii. 'The Heathen Struggle.' . . . It was not the Church of Paulinus which nerved Oswald to this struggle for the Cross (A.D. 635, after Penda's defeat of Eadwine in 633). Paulinus had fled from Northumbria at Eadwine's fall, and the Roman Church in Kent shrank into inactivity before the heathen reaction. Its place in the conversion of England was taken by missionaries from Ireland. . . . Christianity had been received there with a burst of popular enthusiasm, and letters and arts sprang up rapidly in its train. While the vigour of Christianity in Italy and Gaul and Spain was exhausted in a bare struggle for life, Ireland, unscourged by invaders, drew from its conversion an energy such as it has never known since. The science and Biblical knowledge which fled from the Continent took refuge in famous schools, which made Durrow and Armagh the universities of the West. Patrick, the first missionary of the island, had not been half a century dead when Irish Christianity threw itself with a fiery zeal into battle with the mass of heathenism which was rolling in upon the Christian world. Irish missionaries laboured among the Picts of the Highlands and the Frisians of the Northern seas. An Irish missionary—Columban—founded monasteries in Burgundy and the Apennines. The canton of S. Gall still commemorates in its name another Irish missionary, before whom the spirits of flood and fell fled wailing over the Lake of Constance. For a time it seemed as if the older race that Roman and German had swept before them had turned to the moral conquest of their conquerors, as if Celtic and not Latin Christianity was to mould the destinies of the Churches of the West. Chrysostom—Ὁρι Θεὸς ὁ Χριστός. Op. Savile,

The Anglo-Celtic Church is real enough, from the Synod of Verulam and its condemnation of Pelagius in 429 with the help of the bishops of Lyons. There is no doubt about S. Patrick's being a real person, or that his work was real work, ending 465 A.D. ; nor yet as to S. Columba at Iona before 563, nor of S. Columban and S. Gall in the Rhætian Alps, nor of S. Aidan's mission to Oswald of Northumbria, nor of the foundation of Lindisfarne in 635, nor of the final submission to Rome at the Synod of Whitby in 664.

The first characteristic of Irish ornament which the student must infallibly notice is the plaited work. It is not peculiar to the West, as Westwood gives a specimen of it from an Arabic MS. in *Palæographia Sacra*, and the guilloche border exemplifies it. It is to be seen in Professor Ruskin's Byzantine capitals in vol. i. of the *Stones of Venice*, and may even be, as he says, in its Eastern form a remembrance of the chequer work and braided work of the Temple of Solomon.

The wonderful development of the almost universal taste for interlaced pattern is common to the Anglo-Saxon and Irish MSS. The pure Irish work is always distinguishable from the English, however, by the entire sacrifice of every consideration, save colour, to complexity of pattern ; and also by the extraordinary skill and minute beauty of its spiral lines, which are almost untraceable to the outer world, though Professor Westwood has had the incalculable energy and patience to copy some of the most elaborate. A great gift of colour is perceptible in the strange miniatures of the *Book of Kells*, where Scriptural subject is attempted not without power or beauty, but with a quaintness which marks the work of an isolated Church which owed Rome nothing, and to which Greece or Syria had taught nothing but the Faith. The study of natural beauty, as a man may see it in leaves and flowers and sunset and sunrise, is not found in these MSS., and their art dies away in complexity. The pious zeal for the text remained, but He who gave the text for knowledge gave also the Book of Nature for ornament. The Irish monk would not read in the latter, and his art begins in rudeness and ends in madness of involved lines ; he still desires to represent the facts and symbolism of the Church, but he has forgotten in his scriptorium what any man or thing is really like. The Crucifixion at the beginning of the Psalter

t. vii. p. 635. Καὶ γὰρ αἱ Βρεττανικοὶ νῆσοι, αἱ τῆς θαλάττης ἐκτὸς κείμεναι ταύτης, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ οὖσαι τῷ Ἀκτανῶ, τῆς δυνάμεως τ. ῥήματος ἡσθοντο· καὶ γὰρ κἀκεῖ ἐκκλησίαι, κ. θυσιαστήρια πεπηγάσιν. Tertullian adv. Judæos, c. vii., Britannorum inaccessa Romanis loca, Christo vero subdita, c. A.D. 200.

of S. John's College, Cambridge, with its attendant angels, or it may be sun and moon, is an interesting and lamentable example of the decay of the intellectual energies of a Church to which such great work had been committed, and which had done it so faithfully. However, the gift of colour often redeems much, as in the *Book of Kells*, where the deep blues, purples, and greens are exquisite, as also the azure and green in the MS. of Brith MacDurnan. As far as I know, it is best paralleled in Ravenna mosaics; and this consideration is important, as it confirms the idea of Professor Westwood that much knowledge of ornament was obtained for the North by English and Irish pilgrims or preachers, who studied the colour of the mosaics, then in their first splendour, and tried, not in vain, to reproduce the play of tessellation in the sacred writing which so delighted their souls. Such copying, or rather imitation, would account for the Byzantine appearance of so many of these works, and perhaps for the attachment to dots and zigzags; except that the Northern students of Ravennese form seem to have missed the severe, though not incorrect, lines of drapery, and neglected the conventional reference to nature, which still preserved the life of the Eastern schools.¹

At periods when art is hanging between life and death it is not easy to distinguish the archaic from the barbarous; to say which style will grow out of its obvious errors, and which will never arrive at doing anything right. Good Byzantine work is archaic, for it is the second childhood of Old Greece, and the nurse, if not the infancy, of the Gothic Renaissance, or return to Old Greek. But for certain Irish and English ribbon and dot ornament, I fear there is no word for it but barbarous. The interlaced work, variously derived from Gothic hurdles, British wicker-work,² Runic knots, Saxon leg-bandages, &c., has already been spoken of as found in architecture. It is certainly more rare in Eastern art³ (there is none, for example, in the Syrian MS. of Rabula, though it contains chevrons, lozenges, zigzags, flowers, fruits, and

¹ 'Byzantine Olive,' *Stones of Venice*, vol. iii. p. 179.

² I have Professor Westwood's authority for the following facts:—Mr. French, of Liverpool, celebrated for his antiquarian knowledge, orders a wicker cross to be made in Ireland, forwarding a pattern. It comes home admirably executed, with the exception that a ring has been added round the arms, forming the perfect Runic cross. It was impossible, the workman said, to fasten them securely without using it. What a light this throws on the origin of ornament, interlaced and other. It is only the great constructive rule of architecture over again.

³ See Westwood, p. 8, *Arabic MSS.*

birds).¹ In Northern miniature and writing it is universal, and in Irish and English work passes into the wildest intricacy of spirals and every variety of ribboned and spotty ornament, with a grotesque use of lacertine or ophidian forms everywhere, which frequently border on the diabolical. In fact, we here come in contact with a wild and morbid grotesque, the earliest forms, perhaps, of the Northern love of jest and feverish play of invention, and perhaps a century older than the Lombard extravagances of S. Michele of Pavia.² The difference is that the South Scandinavian work (for such is the Lombardic) was based on observation of nature, however excited and irrational; and the Irish was that of incurious ascetics, who saw no good in nature. It seems to have given considerable offence to the Benedictine authors of the *Nouv. Traité de Diplomatie* (ii. 122), as they complain with some acrimony of the 'imagination atroces et mélancoliques' of the derivative Anglo-Saxon MSS., which they charitably attribute to climate. Their remarks are not unfounded; but this kind of work may have been occasioned by echoes or reflexions of contest with ophidian and Gnostic symbolism, as we have heard the interlaced work traced, not without probability, to the wicker of the great Druidical idols. Still this form of grotesque points onward to the future Gothic taste for oddity and putting right heads on wrong shoulders. A kind of awed and half-terrified spirit of jesting may possibly be detected even in Greek representations of the serpent, as in the extraordinary quadruped-snake of Eden in a seventh- or eighth-century MS. in the Vatican. He stood for evil; and to monks of that time all nature may have seemed like a masque or mystery of evil.

The middle of the ninth century is the period assigned by Professor Westwood for the evident influence of artists of the schools of Charlemagne on the productions of English scriptoria. For though many Frankish schools were presided over by Alcuin and other learned Englishmen, yet both they and the Franks were led, by more frequent intercourse with Rome, to a higher appreciation of the relics of classical art; and thus followed the decay of the old ingenuities of unmeaning pattern. The British Church had much to receive in exchange for her liberty.

'Increased communication with Rome,' says Professor Westwood, 'led to the adoption of a more realistic treatment of the human figure,

¹ See, however, *Stones of Venice*, vol. ii.; *Pal. Sac.*, 'Arabic Gospels,' No. 8.

² See *Stones of Venice*, vol. i. app. 8, 'The Northern Energy.

as well as to a more *general adoption of foliage* as an element of ornamental design. Indeed, after the ninth or first half of the tenth century I have been unable to find any Anglo-Saxon MS. executed in the Lindisfarne or Irish style, although, as we have seen, it remained for several centuries longer in use in Ireland, considerably modified, however, in its ornamental details.'

These two points of improvement in Anglo-Saxon (or English) work mark the Professor's agreement with what we have been contending for on the purely pictorial side—the evidence of renewed study of nature in French and English work, learnt from the relics of Græco-Roman art. It was part of the firstfruits of the new life of Christian civilisation north of the Alps, and existed as it could, only in religious hands. In Lombardy the noble and beautiful life of the great cities of Milan, Pisa, and Florence, with the great genius of the population, soon produced far higher results. Emerging from heavy trials, and preparing for yet more, Christianity was now monastic; but the Church bore her arts with her, in their ascetic form of caligraphy and miniature, whithersoever she fled into the wilderness. She issues from Ireland, and from Rome, to possess the English race for ever. From Ireland her fairly written MSS. testify to the peace that they had, even in days of general massacre, who loved the laws of God; to the sacredness of the word, and the delight of the caligrapher in it; and his patterns show in their intricate beauty and gift of colour the monk's pleasant simplicity and contented labour, without much thought, and happy for a time in his skill only. From the seventh to the tenth century Rome is prostrate, except for the alliance of the new Empire; and the stream of Christian teaching, verbal and pictorial, bears its Celtic missionaries over the Continent, bearing help to Latin Christianity. Rome is for a time reformed by Gregory the Great, and then allied with Pepin and Charlemagne; and the relics of her art and learning are eagerly embraced by Lombards, Franks, and English, so that the Anglo-Saxon caligraphists begin to take lessons in their turn of Greece and Rome, and to prefer miniature to mere pattern, and emulate (or produce) the grand Carolingian MSS. In these the study of nature is a leading feature, a more important one than their Imperial splendour, or than their Merovingian and Visigothic grotesqueness; and with the study of nature the Gothic copyists now combined the faithful emulation of classical models, such as they knew. Their willingness to learn of the past was equal, but some had better models than others. There is great difference in the genius, the opportunities,

and the success of Niccola Pisano, Count Vivien, Rabula the Syrian monk, or the writer of the Augustinian or of Athelstan's Psalter, who has not even a name; but the artistic excellence of their work is due to the same principles of study; nor in any of these cases could it have existed but for the operation of the Faith which alone made study possible to them.

ART. IX.—THE LIFE OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS
THE PRINCE CONSORT.

The Life of His Royal Highness the Prince Consort. By
THEODORE MARTIN. Vol. III. (London, 1877.)

THE labours of Mr. Martin on the life of the Prince Consort have been marked by conscientious diligence not less noteworthy than his talent and his equitable temper. With these qualifications, and with the free access to the innermost centres of confidential information, which has been so graciously accorded to him by the Sovereign, he has in his two former volumes presented to us a personal portraiture of the Prince Consort so complete that it scarcely allows the addition of a touch. The biographer, as he proceeds along the course of the revolving years, can indeed lengthen the catalogue of his wise and good actions, and can show how time, as it gives new force, depth, and dignity to the human countenance, even into a prolonged old age, so also imparts a riper mellowness, and a more compact solidity, to mental faculty and work.

Monumental commemoration, which reminds man of his weakness even more than of his strength, and which has been carried farther perhaps in the case of the Prince Consort than of any other distinguished personage, has something in it that jars when it goes beyond the modesty of custom. Yet every statue and memorial of the Prince may in some sense be considered as a sermon made visible. He is one of the few, the very few, characters on the active stage of modern life, in whom the idea of duty seems to be actually personified, and to walk abroad in the costumes of State. It is good for us to be taken back, again and again, to see the spectacle, and so to learn its lessons. After making every allowance for a

work composed almost within the precinct of a Court, and without pretending to determine the precise place which history will finally accord to him upon the roll of greatness, we are safe in saying that upon the extended surface of society we may travel far and wide, before the eye is blessed with so strong and happy a combination of mental and of moral force. Nor can it be questioned, that such combination is more precious to mankind in exact proportion as its seat is found, and its activity developed, near to the summit of the social fabric. Born with all these faculties to a high station, and lifted up by marriage to one of unusual splendour, it was his fate, being torn away in the very flower of his manhood and the vigour of all his gifts, to add to the lustre of his career that peculiar touch of pathos, given by the master artist of heroic character to his Achilles; to whom the consummation of his glory was only permitted on condition of the shortening of his life.¹ In the attentive reader this volume will probably deepen the impression he may have received from those which preceded it, that few indeed have been the lives, in this curiously chequered age of ours, which upon the whole come nearer to the fulfilment of the ideal.

This repeated presentation to the public eye of such a picture, with all its elevating and all its calming influences, is indeed so wholesome that we feel anything rather than displeased with Mr. Martin when he informs us, in his Preface, that the work has in spite of him outgrown the limits which he had appointed for it, and that it must extend through a fourth of these large and portly volumes. The consequence, however, is, that it assumes, as we proceed, the character less of a biography and more of a history. It may also be stated with some confidence that for a final history of the times, and of the great events it touches, it is both too near and too brief. Mr. Martin has evidently been guided in his course by the consideration that the history of the period he has here to traverse was really a part of the Prince's life; so operative was the force that he had exerted in the making of it. Of this the Prince himself, for once, allows himself to speak in significant terms:—

‘The things of all sorts that are laid on our shoulders, i.e. on *mine*, are not to be told. People feel that a certain power exists, which has not thrust itself ostentatiously forward, and therefore they fancy it must be doing harm, even although the results of what it does must all be admitted to be good.—(p. 457.)

¹ *Iliad*, B. ix. 410-6.

There are, indeed, those who surmise that this extension of Mr. Martin's plan has been effected in order to carry back the public mind in large detail to the associations of the Crimean War, and thus to revive the sentiments of hostility to Russia, which at that epoch naturally and warrantably prevailed. But, even apart from the remembrance of the high auspices under which he writes, we know of nothing to justify the imputation to him of a mischievous and paltry trick. The imputation itself is probably due to the exultation with which the portion of our newspaper press, that is hostile to the subject races in Turkey, has gloated on his reference to the cruelty with which, in some instances, our wounded were treated by the Russian soldiers as they lay on the battle-field. This is an excess to be severely reprobated. Prince Menschikoff alleged, in justification, that English prisoners had made use of concealed revolvers (p. 159) to shoot down their captors; but this must have been rare, for he finds it necessary to put in other excuses also, which are frivolous. Attempts have, however, been made to treat this proceeding as parallel to the wicked and indeed fiendish proceedings of the Turks in mutilation and cruel torture on the fields of recent battle. To compare the two is truly *minima componere magnis*. To give no quarter, and to put an end to the life of the wounded, is one thing; to mutilate, to torture, and to burn them is another; and these are the practices, too well attested, of the last few months.¹ Mr. Martin for a moment happens to deviate from his usual impartiality, when he seems (p. 160) to match the simple privation of life with this more than bestial delight in torture. We do not know if it has ever been stated to him, as it has been to us, on the authority of Lord Gough, that there were too many acts of this description committed by the British soldiers, in the war of the Punjaub, on their wounded and disabled enemies.

There is a supposition, much more rational as well as much more charitable, which may tend to account for Mr. Martin's having altered and enlarged his plan at this particular juncture. For this alteration has enabled him not only to show the part which the Prince took in all the anxieties of the Crimean War, but to give us the Prince's evidence in his own detailed and repeated language as to the policy, in furtherance of which it was undertaken. So much has been recently stated, or mis-stated, in regard to the aim and motive

¹ See *e.g.*, the article of Mr. Forbes, in the *Nineteenth Century* for November, p. 571.

of that war, that nothing can be more seasonable than the opportunity he affords us of learning something on the subject from high and dispassionate authority. For the authority is, in truth, very high. We are to regard the Prince Consort as having been while he lived the mind's eye, so to speak, of a Sovereign, who entered with energy into all great transactions. There was such a standing partnership, and common movement of the two, combined with such a harmony of character and feeling, that we may regard the will of either one as speaking for both; and, jointly, they had unrivalled means from day to day for estimating what the French call the 'situation.' From near presence, and close and constant intercourse, reaching far beyond established forms, they knew not only the resolutions of the Aberdeen Cabinet, but the interior mind of all those members of it, who had special titles to exercise an influence on its foreign policy. Of these, the most important were Lord Aberdeen as Prime Minister, and Lord Clarendon as Foreign Secretary. Next to them came Lord Palmerston, on account of his great knowledge and experience in foreign affairs; and Lord John Russell, as the leader of the House of Commons, and as the person who took the seals of the Foreign Office on the formation of that Ministry, and who resigned them shortly afterwards to Lord Clarendon, without doubt for the very sufficient reason that no man can efficiently discharge in conjunction, especially at a time of crisis, the duties of the Foreign Department and those attaching to the leadership of the Commons.

It is a favourite idea with some, that we have had handed down from a remote date a traditional policy of upholding the Ottoman Empire, like Portugal, or Belgium, without much regard to collateral questions. We believe it would be difficult to establish this doctrine by historical evidence. To those who care to examine the question ever so little, we recommend an examination of the speech of Lord Holland in the debate of January 29, 1828. It was delivered at a time when we were engaged in a policy of coercion against Turkey, out of which, just before, had grown the battle of Navarino. Lord Holland appeared to show in that debate that we had indeed ancient alliances with Russia, that we had no treaty at all with Turkey before 1799, that the treaty then concluded was only for seven years, that it was simply part and parcel of our military measures against France. And it commenced with these words:—'His Britannic Majesty, connected already with His Majesty the Emperor of Russia, by the ties of the strictest alliance, accedes by the present treaty

to the defensive alliance which has just been concluded between His Majesty the Ottoman Emperor and the Emperor of Russia,'—with certain limiting words which need not be cited in this place.

It would be curious to ascertain the precise date at which the idea was first broached, that British interests required the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire. We have little doubt that it is posterior to the debate which has just been cited, and that it was far from being generally recognised by the statesmen of the last generation. It may probably be traced in the policy of 1840, and the armed assistance lent to the decrepit Empire against its Egyptian vassal. It grew, however, with rapidity, fostered by the rather womanish suspicions and alarms on behalf of India, of which Russia gradually became the object. It has grown with greater rapidity since the Crimean War, in proportion to the increased susceptibility of the country, which has almost learned to regard political alarm as standing in the first class of its luxuries, those namely which are daily and indispensable.

It may boldly be affirmed that this doctrine of British interests, as involving a necessity of upholding the Ottoman Empire, was not the avowed doctrine of the British Government in the proceedings immediately anterior to the Crimean War. Some there are at the present day who believe that war to have been a war for British interests, founded upon the traditional policy of maintaining the Porte, with all its crimes, in its 'integrity and independence,' as the proper bulwark of our own sway in India. Others have thought that we undertook the war upon a ground certainly more chivalrous; that, seeing a weaker country oppressed by a stronger one, we generously interfered on behalf of the weak against the strong. Of course, such a theory provokes the question, how far it is to reach, and whether we, of all mankind, have taken out a general roving commission of knight errantry,—

'To ride abroad redressing human wrongs.'¹

The work of Mr. Martin supplies weighty evidence, that the policy of the Crimean War was based neither upon the cynical selfishness of the first of these conceptions nor upon the high-flown Quixotry of the last. Unless the Sovereign and her Consort, with their matchless opportunities of knowledge, were absolutely blindfolded, the policy which led us into the war was that of repressing an offence against the

¹ Tennyson's *Guinevere*.

public law of Europe, but only by the united authority of the Powers of Europe. Public law and European concert were in truth its twin watchwords. From the pages before us we will now supply the proof.

'Our conduct throughout,' says the Queen, writing to Lord Aberdeen, on April 1, 1854 (p. 59), 'has been actuated by *unselfishness* and honesty.'

This was at the commencement. At the close, on March 31, 1856, the Queen writes (p. 471) that to Lord Clarendon alone (i.e., alone of those in Paris) 'is due the dignified position the Queen's beloved country holds, thanks to a straightforward, steady; and *unselfish* policy throughout.'

So much for the British interests. On June 21, the Prince Consort delivers a speech at the Trinity House, in which (p. 69) he says:—

'All these difficulties, however, may be considered to be compensated by the goodness of our cause, "the vindication of the public law of Europe."

And also, he proceeds to say, by the French alliance. On July 5, he writes to the Emperor Napoleon (p. 88):—

'Il me sera en outre du plus grand intérêt d'assister à une concentration de troupes de cette noble armée, rangée dans ce moment à côté de la nôtre, pour la défense du droit public européen.'

On November 19 he writes to Lord Clarendon (p. 164) that the aim of the war was

'to put a term at last to a policy which threatened the existence of the Ottoman Empire, and, by making all the countries bordering on the Black Sea dependencies of Russia, seriously to endanger the balance of power.'

To the King of the Belgians, on February 16, 1855, the Prince writes, complaining of the charges made against us (p. 447); and, among others, of this—that we were 'making a tool of France for our own objects in the East (because of India, &c.)':—

'The truth of the matter, on the contrary, is, that a great European question was at issue, and France and ourselves were, and still are, the only Powers possessed of the firmness, the courage, AND THE DISINTERESTEDNESS to grapple with it.'

That other and lower views gradually found acceptance in lower quarters, we do not doubt. But these were the views embraced at the Court, guided as it was by rare integrity, unsurpassed intelligence, and ample *connaissance de cause*.

And the language we have cited is in full harmony with the general strain of the correspondence laid before Parliament. At the outset, the quarrel was one between Russia and France in regard to ecclesiastical privileges at the Holy Places. England was but an *amicus curiæ*; and, in that capacity, she thought Russia in the right. As, however, the communications went on, the Czar, unfortunately, committed his case to a special envoy, Prince Menschikoff, whose demands upon the Porte appeared to the British Government to render harmony in the Turkish Empire, if they should be accepted, thenceforth impossible. In the further stages of the correspondence, which had thus shifted its ground, we found ourselves in company with France; and not with France only, but with Europe. At one particular point, it must in fairness be allowed that Russia, with her single rapier, had all her antagonists at a disadvantage. They had collectively accepted, and they proposed to her a Note, known as the Vienna Note, which she also accepted; and they afterwards receded from it, upon objection taken to it by Turkey. Russia, however, covered the miscarriage of her opponents by sustaining the Turkish interpretation of the words, and thus sheltered their retreat from the support of the document they themselves had framed. But it was not upon this miscarriage that the dispute came to a final issue. The broken threads of negotiation were pieced together; and, about the time when the year expired, a new instrument, of a moderate and conciliatory character, was framed at Constantinople, and approved by the Cabinets of the five Powers, still in unbroken union. It was the rejection of this plan by the Emperor Nicholas, when it was presented to him in January 1854, and not his refusal of the Turkish amendments to the Vienna Note, that brought about the war in the following March.

Thus far the Prince and the Queen have enabled us to vindicate the British policy against the accusation of selfishness. Let us now see how it stands on the other side, as against the charge of Quixotry. If it is wholly unwise and unwarrantable for one Power to constitute itself the judge and the avenger of European law, is it wholly wise and reasonable for two? So far as a question of this kind can be answered in the abstract, undoubtedly it is not. It is a precedent by no means free from danger; a couple of States cannot claim for themselves European authority. But this was not the enterprise, on which France and England advisedly set out. They began their work, say from the time of the Menschikoff mission, in close association with Austria and with Prussia; and the four to-

gether were the only Powers who, by established usage, could represent the concert of Europe, in a case where the fifth and only remaining Power of the first order was itself the panel in the dock. They pursued their work in harmony through the whole of the year 1853. With March 1854 came the crisis. Austria urged the two leading States, England and France, to send in their *ultimatum* to Russia, and promised it her support. She redeemed the pledge, but only to the extent of a strong verbal advocacy. Without following out the subsequent detail of her proceedings, she rendered thereafter to the Allies but equivocal and uncertain service, without however disavowing their policy either in act or word. It was Prussia, which at the critical moment, to speak in homely language, bolted; the very policy which she had recommended, she declined unconditionally to sustain, from the first moment when it began to assume the character of a solid and stern reality. In fact, she broke up the European concert, by which it was that France and England had hoped, and had had a right to hope, to break the stubbornness of the Czar, and to repel his attack upon the public law of Europe. The question that these Allies had now to determine was whether, armed as they had been all along with the panoply of moral authority, they would, upon this unfortunate and discreditable desertion, allow all their demands, their reasonings, their professions, to melt into thin air. They were, in the view of public right, perhaps entitled to decline the heavy responsibility of executing alone what they had counselled and designed with others. At least there could have been no one with a good title to reproach them. But would such a retreat, such a *λιποταξία*, by two such Powers, have been for the permanent advantages of European honour, or legality, or peace?

We shall now produce evidence of the same class as before, and from the same sources, to show that the views we have thus expressed were those of the British Court at the epoch of the Crimean War. We shall show how it was there and then believed that the continued concert of Europe would abash the offender, and settle the dispute without bloodshed; how the Powers, and especially the Power, were regarded, which paralyzed that concert, and broke it up.

On August 28, 1854 (p. 98), the Prince writes thus to the King of Prussia:—

‘The four Powers acted in perfect harmony up to last March, when Prussia rejected the Quadruple Treaty, which Austria, with the wisest intentions, had proposed.’

On November 8 (p. 143) he addresses his uncle, King Leopold, and describes the danger that France may be tempted 'to cherish her traditional *arrière-pensées* of territorial aggrandisement' :—

'This danger, I repeat, Austria, Prussia, and Germany may avert, by acting with us, not in the manipulation of Protocols, which leave everything to the exertions of the Western Powers, and have no object but to make sure that no harm is done to the enemy. Such a course is dishonourable, immoral, leads to distrust, and ultimately to direct hostility. Already the soreness of feeling here against Prussia is intense.'

And as to France, October 23, 1854 (p. 137) :—

'In Boulogne the army, as I now hear, was in hopes to have to fight next year with Prussia.'

Much later, on October 29, 1855 (p. 385), the Prince writes to Baron Stockmar :—

'The position taken up by Austria and Prussia is alone to blame for all ; and I tremble for the Nemesis !'

Mr. Martin himself, describing this condition of sentiment, says (p. 161) :—

'As the tragic events of this terrible war were more and more developed, more and more keenly was it felt that all its miseries and carnage might have been prevented, had the German Powers gone heart and hand with those of the West in telling Russia that if she persisted in her aggression on Turkey, she would have to meet them also in the field.'

When, however, the fight had been fought, and the allied Powers were about to obtain the fruits of it in a Treaty of Peace, then Prussia made her claim, as one of the great Powers, to take part in the negotiations. With respect to this claim, the Prince shows, on February 16, 1855 (p. 449), that it is inadmissible. Powers must not, he says, take part in the great game of politics, without having laid down their stake :—

'Besides, the question here is between Powers who have waged war against each other, and wish to conclude a peace. What right, then, have others to interfere who have taken no part in the conflict, and have constantly maintained that their interests are not touched by the matter in dispute, and that, therefore, they would not take any part in the business ?'

Prussia was accordingly excluded from the arrangements between the belligerents ; and only afterwards was allowed to appear at the meetings of the Powers for the purpose of

considering the general and European arrangements embodied in the Treaty of 1856.

The restrained and sometimes mysterious conduct of Austria is repeatedly censured; but her case was entirely distinct. Her occupation of the Principalities had at least the air of a qualified co-operation; her menace of an entire junction with the Allies (p. 425) had to do with the final succumbing of Russia; and her moral weight was with them throughout.

There are those who will draw comparisons, *mutatis nominibus*, between the drama of 1853-6 and that of 1875-8. There was in each case an offender against the law and peace of Europe; Turkey, by her distinct and obstinate breach of covenant, taking on the later occasion the place which Russia had held in the earlier controversy. There were in each case prolonged attempts to put down the offence by means of European concert. In 1853-4, these proceeded without a check until the eve of the war. In 1875-7, the combination was sadly intermittent; but, in the singular and unprecedented Conference at Constantinople, it was, at least on the part of the assembled representatives, perfectly unequivocal. In 1854, the refusal of Prussia to support words by acts completely altered the situation; and in 1876-7, the assurance conveyed to Turkey from England, that only moral suasion was intended, had the same effect. The difference was that, in 1854-5, two great Powers, with the partial support of a third, prosecuted by military means the work they had undertaken; in 1877 it was left to Russia alone to act as the hand and sword of Europe, with the natural consequence of weighting the scale with the question what compensation she might claim, or would claim, for her efforts and her sacrifices. This parallel we may leave to the impartial criticism of our readers.

Thus far we have seen that the design of the Crimean War was, in its groundwork, the vindication of European law against an unprovoked aggression. It sought, therefore, to maintain intact the condition of the menaced party against the aggressor; or in other words, to defend against Russia the integrity and independence of the Ottoman Empire. The condition of the Christian subjects of the Porte in general was a subject that had never before that epoch come under the official consideration of Europe. The internal government of a country, it may safely be laid down, cannot become the subject of effective consideration by other States, except in cases where it leads to consequences in which they have a true *locus standi*, a legitimate concern on their own particular

account, or on account of the general peace. In the case of Greece, an insurrection growing into a civil war, and disturbing the Levant, had created this *locus standi*; and the interference of three Powers, led by Great Britain, had redressed the mischief. No like door had then been opened in the other Christian provinces of Turkey. The dispute upon the Holy Places in 1853 had very partially opened it, when Russia demanded for herself exclusively a right of intervention on behalf of the Oriental Christians. It thus became necessary, in determining the policy of the future, to take notice of the condition of the subject races. The greatest authorities, and pre-eminently Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, believed in the capacity of the Porte by internal reforms to govern its subjects on the principle of civil equality. The resolution therefore was taken to pursue this end, but without that infringement of the Porte's sovereign rights which Russia had attempted; and this resolution was formally embodied in a Protocol at the outbreak of the war by the Allies and by Austria. The conclusion of the peace in 1856 fell to the lot of Lord Palmerston and his colleagues. In the interest of the Porte, and of the general peace of Europe, they cancelled the rights of separate interference previously possessed and claimed by Russia. They took the Principalities under a direct European protection. On behalf of the subject races generally, they embodied in the treaty the record of the Hatti-humayoum, or edict issued by the Sultan, which purported to establish securely the civil equality of all races and religions in Turkey. This was undoubtedly a covenant on the part of the Sultan. But it was a covenant without penalty for breach; for the Powers expressly renounced any right to call him to account, not, however, generally, but only as growing out of the communication he had made. It was thus, in cancelling the Russian treaties with the Porte, that the Powers of Europe first became, by the Treaty of Paris in 1856, responsible in the last resort for securing the government of the subject races in Turkey on principles of civil equality.

The terms demanded from Russia before the war had been exceedingly moderate. When the war had broken out, the Allies justly availed themselves of their understood right to enlarge these terms. Now, in July 1854, appeared on the ground for the first time the celebrated Four Points. After the fall of Sebastopol, they were again enlarged; a territorial cession, the extinction and not merely the limitation of naval power in the Black Sea, and some provisions relating to the Baltic, were exacted from Russia. In like manner we are

now (as far as is known) witnessing the expansion of the minimised demands of the Conference at Constantinople into a real and effective liberation of Bulgaria, the cession of Armenia, and perhaps other conditions. But what it is curious to note is the relative attitudes of the Court and the Cabinet of Lord Palmerston at the time of the Peace. We must look upon that Peace, according to the evidence of Mr. Martin's volume, as due to the Cabinet, and as accepted at Windsor on constitutional grounds, rather than because it was approved on its own merits. On March 21, 1856 (p. 470), the Prince writes :—

'The Peace is to be signed on Monday. It is not such as we could have wished ; still, infinitely to be preferred to the prosecution of the war, with the present complication of general policy.'

The views of the Queen are expressed in a letter to the Emperor on April 3 (p. 473):—

'Although sharing in the feeling of the majority of my people, who think this Peace is perhaps a little premature, I feel bound to tell you that I approve highly of the terms in which it is couched, as a result not unworthy of the sacrifices made by us in common during this just war, and as insuring, so far as this is possible, the stability and the equilibrium of Europe.'

Even those who do not at all think the Peace to have been premature must, as witnesses, corroborate the opinion of Her Majesty with respect to the popular sentiment at the time. This had, during the negotiations of 1853, been calm and moderate in a high degree. It was first thrown into excitement by the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Sinopè ; which, being simply a military *coup*, was, under some unknown code of sentiment, branded as a massacre. The sufferings of the army during the winter very greatly heightened, as was natural, the susceptibility of the country. But now in October, 1854, the Prince writes (p. 137), that men, 'if they have seen blood, are no longer the same, and are not to be controlled The cry now is for the annihilation of Russia.' It was much to the credit of Lord Palmerston and his Cabinet, that the Peace was actually made ; for it was not without hazard to their popularity that the work was carried through.

Such is, we believe, a fair outline of the case of the Crimean War, as it is exhibited in this volume. That war passed through all the phases of popularity ; the people, and especially the newspapers, were so fond of it while it lasted, that they were, as we have seen, reluctant to let it end. It is

an unquestionable fact, that Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright, who stoutly and most disinterestedly opposed it, and who, with the bloom of the Corn Law triumph upon them, were before it began the most popular men in the country, lost for the time, by their opposition to it, all hold upon the general public. The war, however, soon and even rapidly waned in favour. At length it came to be looked upon by many, if not by most, as an admitted folly. The nation appeared to have come round to the opinion of Cobden and of Bright. And yet the war had attained its purpose; which was, to repress effectually the aggression of Russia, and to secure to Turkey breathing time and full scope for the reform of its government. It may be said that she did not reform it. Most true; but it is only within a short time that this fact has become at all generally known to our countrymen. And, moreover, this reform was not, properly speaking, the object of the war, but rather an aim incidental to the conditions of the Peace. Why, then, did it fall into disfavour? Because men estimated its object, not as it appears in this volume, not as it was drawn out in the minds of the statesmen who made the war, but according to their own unauthorised and exaggerated ideas of its aim, and of the position of the several parties. Turkey, it was too commonly held, was a young vigorous country, only wanting an open and calm atmosphere to break out into the beauty and bloom of a young civilisation. Russia was to be broken up, or at the least to be crippled by the amputation of important members. The extravagance of these anticipations led to disappointment; and the disappointment, for which people had themselves, or perhaps their newspapers, to thank, was avenged upon the Crimean War.

The persons who are really entitled to vaunt their foresight in this matter, as superior alike to the views of sovereigns and of statesmen, are the few, the very few, who objected to the war from the beginning to the end, and who founded this objection not upon a philanthropic yet scarcely rational proscription of war under all circumstances and conditions, but upon a deeper insight into the nature and foundations of Mahometan power over Christian races, than had fallen to the lot either of diplomacy or of statesmanship. Of these, perhaps the most distinguished are Mr. Freeman and Dr. Newman, both of whom in 1853 proclaimed the hopeless nature, not of the Ottoman as such, but of the Ottoman ascendancy. Both have republished their works of that date, and Mr. Freeman has taken a most active and able part in all the recent controversies; in which, to the surprise of many

admirers, the living voice of Dr. Newman has not once been heard.

Independently of its actual history, the Crimean War has in various unexpected ways left its mark upon us. The factitious reputation, the thin gloss of character, with which it invested Turkey, enabled that most corrupt of States to ape with effect one great vice of civilisation, by accumulating in twenty years of peace a debt of two hundred millions. The market value of this debt is at present almost twenty millions; and he would be a sanguine man who could believe that, with the restoration of peace, it could ever reach one-fourth of the sum which Turkey pledged herself to pay. This vast amount was divided between the profits of middlemen, the speculations of Pachas, the unbounded cost of the profligacy of Sultans, the payment of old dividends out of new capitals, and, it must be added, the creation of a highly respectable iron fleet, and of an excellent war *matériel*, which has cost the Russians many a thousand lives. All this, we apprehend, has been done mainly at the charges of France and England, whose joint losses on the Turkish debt may be thought to form a sort of disastrous postscript to the Crimean alliance, and *pendant* to the hundred and fifty millions which they spent upon the War.

There were two other changes, which became perceptible after the War, and which ought, perhaps, to be referred to it as a cause. One of them is the more feverish condition of the public mind with regard to affairs abroad.

The long continuance of the French Revolutionary War, and the numerous disasters which preceded a final triumph mainly due to the intoxication of Napoleon, fairly nauseated the public taste, or appetite, for war. Moreover, there had been entailed upon us a Debt nominally of eight, but really of nine, hundred millions; a sum which probably represented more nearly a third than a fourth part in value of the entire possessions of the country, so that every man who thought himself owner of three thousand pounds, in truth owned not greatly more than two. Together with this Debt, there was an elaborate system of protective legislation, fettering the industry by which alone our burdens could be borne or diminished, and a widely-spread, and but too natural and intelligible, political disaffection. From 1815 until the Crimean period, the nation may be said to have formed one great peace society; and invasion of the island by a hostile power, though it had been brought so near under Napoleon, was hardly dreamt of. During that period, a fresh guarantee of

peace seemed to be afforded us in a close and cordial alliance with France, which seems to have been sublimated, so to speak, into a very notable personal affection between the reigning houses. In August, 1855, Her Majesty, habitually measured in thought and expression, says of the Emperor (p. 351):—

‘I know few people whom I have felt involuntarily more inclined to confide in and speak unreservedly to; I should not fear saying anything to him. I felt—I do not know how to express it—safe with him.’

A letter on the 29th of the same month ends as follows (p. 522):—

‘Permettez que j’exprime ici tous les sentiments de tendre amitié et d’affection avec lesquels je me dis, Sire et cher Frère, de Votre Majesté Impériale la bien bonne et affectionnée Sœur et Amie,

‘VICTORIA R.’

And even of the Prince the Queen had reported (p. 351):—

‘He quite admits that it is extraordinary how very much attached one becomes to the Emperor, when one lives with him quite at one’s ease, and intimately.’

In 1857, during the Indian Mutiny, our friendship was, as it were, re-consecrated by the invitation of the Emperor to send our troops through France on the way to the East. Yet in 1859, after two short years, our Military and Naval Estimates were largely augmented, and a new and very costly scheme of fortifications was proposed, under the influence of a general apprehension that invasion from France had become a probable contingency, requiring great schemes of defensive precaution. When the civil war in America led to a vast development of military power, British susceptibility fastened on the United States as its object, and the belief became fashionable that we were to be invaded in Canada. When Germany had obtained, by the War of 1870–1, the greatest triumph recorded in her annals, then it was Germany that was to invade us. In the intervals of these alarms, the danger of India from Russia was always available, to sustain this morbid and somewhat womanish excitement.

The second of the changes to which we have referred has been the immense increase in the Military and Naval Estimates since the Crimean War. Without entering into minute details, it may be stated that our average annual expenditure under these heads is much more than twice the

amount at which it was placed in 1835 by the Conservative Government of Sir Robert Peel ; and that, after setting aside special expenditure for secondary wars, the average annual charge for the years 1830-50 did not greatly exceed half what it has been for the years 1857-77. It would not be fair to ascribe the whole of this change to the altered humour of the public. Something considerable is due to the change in armaments, and the increased value of labour. Yet we believe it to be the fact that that altered humour, assiduously wrought upon by the professional spirit, and the promoters of expenditure in general, has been the main cause of the alteration, and not a real and substantive necessity. There has been one important change made which has of itself constituted a great and most valuable economy. We have been enabled to give up, in the greater part of our colonies, the dangerous and costly practice of studding them, under a professed notion of defence, with small fractions of the British army. This economy renders yet more striking that vast increase of charge, of which only the increased wealth of the country at large has made it, as a whole, so little sensible.

There have been arguments used on behalf of this change of system. One has been the growth of Continental armaments. But the chief powers of the Continent have been engaged in wars on a large scale, with which we have had nothing to do. France, Prussia, and Austria have, each of them, had two such wars in the last twenty years. Then it has been a favourite plea that by keeping liberal military and naval establishments we should be placed in a state of security and saved from panics. But the result has been exactly the reverse. While our expenditure remained low, the dread of invasion was a thing hardly known. We make this statement advisedly, notwithstanding the reference to panics in and before 1852, mentioned by the Prince in February of that year (*Life*, ii. 433). These we take to have been no more than whispers within the Army and the Court. They did not really lay hold on the public mind. But since our charges have been so largely augmented, we have had, it may be said, a continuing series of panics, with first one Power and then another as the object of our apprehensions. Again, it has been said, the Duke of Wellington was favourable to the new system. And that is, in some measure, true of the great Duke in his later years ; but whoever heard of it when he was Prime Minister, or before old age was upon him ? It was as he approached fourscore, during the Administration of Sir Robert Peel, that the Duke became an alarmist. But it is

unquestionable that his fears were, notwithstanding his great authority, regarded by that prudent Minister and his colleagues as due to the commencing weakness of age, and were not allowed to act upon the amounts of force which from year to year they proposed to Parliament for the defence of the country.

But, lastly, it was found very convenient to ascribe the very sad sufferings and shortcomings of the winter spent before Sebastopol to the previous economies of the time of peace. Evidently an impression had been made to this effect (p. 486) upon the just and intelligent mind of the Queen herself. But what is the warrant for it? The war broke out; and we, who had no pretensions to be a great military power, actually fought the battle of the Alma with a somewhat larger number of men than France, at that time the first military Power in the world, had been able to find and transport for the purpose. It is said, and is believed, that after that battle the British General felt a confidence in the power of the Allies at once to master Sebastopol, which the French did not feel, and that it was their negative which prevented the attempt. Next, we, who had been paralysed forsooth by economy, had assigned to us the right flank to the south of the fortress, which was the post of danger, while the French forces lay in comparative security between the British and the sea. Upon us, in consequence, came the heavy stress of Inkermann, and our gallant soldiers bore it. True, the ranks of our army were afterwards miserably thinned by sickness. The country was justly irritated, and demanded enquiry. The demand was met not with a single enquiry, but with three. There was one by a Committee of Parliament; one by Royal Commissioners sent to the spot; and one by a Board of Officers at Chelsea. They delivered three different and conflicting verdicts; but no one of them found that the cause of the mischief lay in parsimony practised before the war; the charge is one often and conveniently made, but never proved.

It is true, without doubt, that our organisation was deficient in various branches. But it has never been shown that the really needful improvements might not have been made within those general limits of charge which subsisted during the reign of comparative economy. The truth we believe to be this. Our military authorities were wedded to the antiquated system of soldiering for life, which stands in diametrical opposition to the laws of military practice now universally acknowledged. As long as that system prevailed, it was naturally deemed the most essential point of all to

keep up a force, numerically considerable, of old soldiers. To this end not only persuasion, but something like artifice, was addressed. So many regiments were kept in British North America, so many in the West Indies, and in other Colonial garrisons; because this dispersion presented the aspect of a quasi-military service, and a portion of the army was, as it were, kept out of view. The economies were accordingly thrown to some extent upon the wrong points; the *matériel* was very low; a long period was allowed to pass without measures—by far the most vital of all—for improving the condition of the soldier; and the impulse towards those measures, and towards real reform in the army, when it did come, was a civil rather than a military impulse. Indeed, there is no reason to doubt that in his later years the Duke of Wellington, alarmist as he had become, was also an obstacle to the detailed and toilsome work of administrative reform in the army. It had, however, been fairly begun under Lord Hardinge, alike an able administrator and an excellent man, and it was in course of prosecution when the Crimean War broke upon us.

The Prince could not but bring from Germany military conceptions which were, as to certain aims, much in advance of those current among ourselves; and at the epoch of the war, as well as before it, his active mind was turned to the consideration of our deficiencies. He laid his views before the Government of Lord Aberdeen in an able Memorandum (p. 185), which contains much important matter. He had, indeed, so early as in his letter of February 19, 1852, to the Duke of Wellington, suggested the invaluable system of reserves, which is still so feebly and inadequately worked. In other respects, however, it can hardly be said to move upon the lines of army reformers generally, since it does not include any one of three points which with them were essential; namely, short service for the men, abolition of purchase for the officers, and the abandonment of the expense of garrison forces in colonies other than military posts.

We have already pointed out that the character of the Volume before us is historical quite as much as biographical, and we shall further notice in succession two or three points of interest on which it throws a light.

The attachment of the Sovereign and her Consort to Sir Robert Peel, the Duke of Wellington, and Lord Aberdeen, led them to watch with interest the working of the Aberdeen Cabinet, in which the Peelites held no less than six offices, besides having four members of their small party in the most

important positions outside the Cabinet. The six Cabinet Ministers were Lord Aberdeen, the Duke of Argyll,¹ Sir James Graham, the Duke of Newcastle, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Sidney Herbert. The four outside the door were Mr. Cardwell at the Board of Trade, Lord Canning at the Post Office, Lord St. Germans, Viceroy of Ireland, and Sir John Young, Chief Secretary. Another Cabinet Minister, Sir William Molesworth, was more nearly associated with them than with the Whigs. Holding this large share of official power, the Peelites did not bring more than about thirty independent votes to the support of the Ministry, in addition to which they neutralised the opposition of perhaps as many more members who sat on the other side of the House. Mr. Martin says (p. 90), 'It was apparent to all the world that no cordial unanimity existed between the Peelite section of the Ministry and their colleagues.'

This is an entire mistake. It must be stated, to the credit of all parties, but especially of the Whig section of that Cabinet, that although the proportions of official power were so different from those of the voting strength in Parliament, there was no sectional demarcation, nor any approach to it, within the Cabinet. In proof of this statement, it may be mentioned that when, in the recess of 1853-4, Lord Palmerston had resigned his office on account of the impending Reform Bill, and it was desired to induce him to reconsider his decision, the two persons who communicated to him the wish of his colleagues were the Duke of Newcastle and Mr. Gladstone. Not even when the Eastern Question became the engrossing subject of the day was a sectional division to be traced. It may be true, if *nuances* are to be minutely investigated, that the Peelite colour was on the whole a shade or two more pacific than the Whig; but even this is true of the leading individuals rather than of the sections, and it may be safely affirmed that, of all the steps taken by that Government during the long and complicated negotiations before the Crimean War, there was not one which was forced, as will sometimes happen, by a majority of the Cabinet upon the minority. Rifts there were without doubt in the imposing structure, but they were due entirely to individual views or pretensions, and in no way to sectional antagonism.

The retirement of Lord Aberdeen was a subject of grief

¹ The Duke of Argyll was invited at a very early age, on account of his high personal character and his talent, to enter the Cabinet of Lord Aberdeen, but he did not belong to the ex-official corps who passed by the name of Peelites, while he was in political accordance with them.

to the Court and to his friends; but he was so far fortunate that, having been made the victim of a cry, partly popular and partly due to political feeling, he was saved, as was the Duke of Newcastle, from the responsibility of an act of difficult and doubtful choice. Their friends, Sir James Graham, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Sidney Herbert, were less happy. It was their fate to join the Cabinet of Lord Palmerston, formed after some delay and difficulty, and then to quit it within a fortnight or three weeks. The cause was simply and solely this: the Aberdeen Government had resisted, unanimously and strongly, the appointment of what was termed the Sebastopol Committee; the Palmerston Government set out with the intention of continuing that resistance. Its Head, and the majority of its members, arrived at the conclusion that the resistance would be ineffectual; and they determined to succumb. The Peelites adhered to their text; and, as the minority, they in form resigned, but in fact, and of necessity, were driven from their offices. Into the rights of the question we shall not enter; but, undoubtedly, they were condemned by the general opinion out of doors. Moreover, as in the letting out of water, the breach, once made, was soon and considerably widened. They had been parties in the Cabinet, not only to the war, but to the extension, after the outbreak had taken place, of the conditions required from Russia. But when it appeared that those demands were to be still further extended, or were to be interpreted with an unexpected rigour, and that the practical object of the Ministerial policy appeared to be a great military success in prosecuting the siege of Sebastopol to a triumphant issue, they declined to accompany the Ministry in their course. Again they met with the condemnation of the country; and the Prince Consort, while indicating his high opinion of the men, has recorded (p. 298 *et alibi*) his adverse judgment. One admission may perhaps be made in their favour. In the innumerable combinations of the political chessboard, there is none more difficult for an upright man than to discern the exact path of duty, when he has shared in bringing his country into war, and when, in the midst of that war, he finds that it is being waged for purposes in apparent excess of those which he had approved.

The course of the Sebastopol enquiries likewise tended to show, that the high constitutional doctrine which they had set up could not be infringed with impunity. They had held that the enquiry was an executive duty, and could only be conducted aright by a Commission under the authority of

the Crown. The country felt, or thought, it had obtained a triumph by the appointment of a Parliamentary Committee, which was capped, as we have said, by a Commission, and this in its turn traversed by a Board of Officers. The Committee censured the Ministers; though it was plain that, in the business of supply, they, and Mr. Sidney Herbert in particular, with an indefatigable diligence, had run far ahead of any demands received from the camp. The Commission censured the executive departments of the army on the spot. The Board of Officers acquitted the military, and censured the commissariat at home. No attempt was permitted to try the question to its core, as between these conflicting judgments. Mr. Roebuck very properly made a motion to bring the Report of the Committee under the consideration of the House, when the other two competing verdicts would have been compared with it, and with one another. The Peelites supported his motion. But he was defeated by a large majority; so that the question which broke up one Cabinet, and formidably rent another, which agitated England and sorely stained her military reputation in the eyes of Europe, remained then, and remains now, untried by any court of final appeal. Nor did this determined smothering of so great a matter cause public displeasure. On the contrary, as Mr. Martin observes (p. 308), it gave satisfaction. The feeling, he says truly, was turned into other channels. 'The past could not be mended—best leave it alone.' The nation was befooled; and befooled with pleasure, and by its own act.

A survey of these years, conducted in an historic spirit, will, we think, leave on the mind, among other impressions, a sense of the great incidental evils which accompany the breaking up of those singularly, but finely and strongly, organised wholes, our known political parties. Together with Sir Robert Peel, nearly the whole official corps of the Conservatives was discharged in 1846; and the discharge proved to be a final one. The Tories, when brought into office, had to supply the highest places with raw, that is to say, fresh recruits. This could not be without some detriment to the public service; but justice requires the admission that the body of English gentry, trained in the English fashion, affords material of great aptitude for public life. There were evils on the other side much more serious than this. It took no less than thirteen years to effect the final incorporation of the Peelites into the Liberal party. When they took their places among its leaders, the official staff on one side was doubled, as on the other side it was annihilated. It is possible that to this

duplication ought greatly to be attributed those personal discontents, and political cross-purposes, for which the Liberal party has of late years been disastrously remarkable. Moreover, for eleven out of these thirteen years of disembodied existence, the Peelites were independent members. They were like roving icebergs, on which men could not land with safety, but with which ships might come into perilous collision. Their weight was too great not to count, but it counted first this way and then that. It is not alleged against them that their conduct was dishonourable, but their political action was attended with much public inconvenience; and even those who think they were enlightened statesmen may feel that the existence of these sensibly large weights, in a state of detachment from all the organisation of party, acts upon the Parliamentary vessel as a cargo of corn in bulk acts on the trim of a ship at sea. Again, as a party, they had been, like their leader, pacific, and economical. The effects of their separation from official Liberalism during the first Government of Lord Palmerston were easily traceable in the policy of that Government as to various matters of importance. From this time onwards Lord Aberdeen was in retirement, and Peelism ceased to be, as such, in contact with the Court, at which it had certainly weighed as an important factor of political opinion.

The Prince resembled Lord Aberdeen in this, that, with an eminently just and liberal mind, he clung to traditions of Continental policy, or these traditions clung to him, which were by no means uniformly liberal. We cannot but trace his hand in the recognition (p. 44) of the Five Great Powers as having been, 'since the peace of 1815,' the guarantors of treaties, the guardians of civilisation, the champions of right. When Sardinia was struggling for the liberation of Italy, and when she had acted as a very timely ally in the Crimean War, Belgium is emphatically described (p. 501) as 'the only satisfactory child of the new epoch;' and in conversation with Louis Napoleon in 1854, the Prince wished, indeed, that Austria were out of Lombardy for Austria's own sake, but held that she could not recognise its title to an Italian nationality, and that she must hold it for the sake of her military frontier (p. 119). But the reconstituted Italy has thus far been in European politics a Power eminently Conservative; and the only fear is lest she should be seduced, by the bad example of other Powers, into speculations and schemes of territorial aggrandisement.

We have still to offer a remark on the important subject

of the Danubian Principalities, which is touched by Mr. Martin. Subsequently to the Peace of Paris, Moldavia and Wallachia were united into one State under the name of Roumania, and after a time there was placed at its head a foreign Prince. To this measure Austria and the Porte were strongly opposed; and we grieve to say that the influence of official England was thrown into their scale. Its adoption was mainly due to the sound instinct and the decided action of the people of the two Provinces; which Russia at the very least thought it prudent not to thwart, and which France energetically favoured and helped onwards to a successful issue. Lord Clarendon expressed the opinion (p. 466) that, if these Provinces were united under a foreign prince, such a prince would in a few years be able to declare his independence.

Mr. Martin, strangely enough to our mind, says that events have shown how just were these apprehensions (p. 465). Is this just? What are the facts? That for twenty years, though the misgovernment of Turkey would at any moment have afforded a pretext, Roumania remained in tranquil submission to the suzerainty of the Porte; that she did nothing to assist the abortive Bulgarian rebellion of May 1876; that she showed no sympathy with the Servian and Montenegrin war of that summer; that she did not take a step of any kind in opposition to the Porte, until the overpowering might of Russia demanded a military passage through her territory, and virtually forced her into active hostilities. Had Turkey fulfilled the promises of civil equality, which she has shamelessly and obstinately broken, but which Lord Clarendon honestly believed she would be able and disposed to keep, what opportunity would Roumania have had, even if so inclined, to rise against Turkey? Did not her quietude, during nearly two years of festering troubles on her frontier, show how wise it had been to give her contentment and some solidity of existence? If Moldavia and Wallachia had continued in their state of severance and weakness, it would have been not more difficult, but much easier, for Russia either to agitate them by intrigue during the tranquil years 1856-75, or to issue her commands for supplying a free passage through their land to her armies.

But we cannot have any quarrel with Mr. Martin. We must part from him in the good humour which gratitude inspires. In the production of his work, he is without doubt ministering to the just demand of a fond and unquenchable affection in the highest place. But he is also performing a

great service to the country : he gives the permanence of the written record to a life of public duty, which is certainly the most conspicuous that the nineteenth century has witnessed. It is perhaps also the noblest and the purest : the only rival to it in these respects, that we are bold enough to name, is the life of Lord Spencer, better known as Lord Althorp.

We venture to hope that Mr. Martin's labours will not end either with three volumes, or with the fourth ; but that when his work is completed, he will with new energy reduce it to a form suited for a wide popular circulation. Outside the circle of domestic affections, the proper place for the Prince's memory to repose in is the heart of the people.

ART. X.—BURIAL ACTS CONSOLIDATION BILL,
1877.

THE Session of Parliament for 1877 will be memorable, if for nothing else, yet certainly for the unexpected change of front upon the Burial question. Until then the question had simmered on after the manner of other assaults upon rights or privileges inherited by the Established Church; it seemed as though, some day, a raid upon the Church's burial-grounds might afford a convenient rallying cry for the scattered hosts of the Liberal party, and that the Church might not improbably be deprived of some of her duties and responsibilities with regard to the precincts of her Churches, when a new turn of the political wheel had reversed the present position of parties in the House of Commons. Last Session brought an unlooked-for ally into the field for those who wished to hasten this catastrophe. It revealed the startling fact that if our churchyards are to be alienated, and the clergy to be deprived of their immemorial trusteeship for them, the hand by which the severance will be effected will not be that of the Liberation Society, or of the Liberal party, but of the Church's own archbishops and of noblemen who have taken an active part in what affects the fortunes and welfare of, at all events, one section of the Church of England.

The present interest in the question has thus come to centre round the events of last Session, and the line of policy

which ought to be pursued in consequence of it. We could add nothing to the history, given in our April number of 1876, of previous Parliamentary conflicts, since this Nonconformist grievance first found expression in Parliament in 1857; neither could we hope to set forth more forcibly the facts on which must be based our judgment of the reality and moral worth of the agitation for a change in those laws, and the objects and aims of the persons who have hitherto conducted that agitation. These will be found in our number of January 1877. We are, therefore, happily limited in our range of dealing with this subject by what we have already said concerning it, not less than by the requirements of the present hour.

It is then to the history of the Burials question in the last Session of Parliament that we purpose mainly to confine ourselves. On March 13 last, the Lord President introduced a Bill which he described as a Burial Acts Consolidation Bill, the special object of which was to deal with the question of burying the dead from a sanitary point of view. The Bill had been anxiously expected, as it was known that such a measure was in preparation. The struggles over Mr. Osborne Morgan's Bill in previous Sessions made Churchmen fearful lest some arrangement or compromise might be attempted, which would make the defence of their churchyards more difficult in the future. From any approximation to this the Government Bill was perfectly free; and it is only right to acknowledge thankfully the manner in which the Government has throughout dealt with the question. Nor would we omit to express our satisfaction with the firm yet conciliatory mode of handling the Bill by the Duke of Richmond, who was charged with the conduct of it, throughout the difficult and trying debates. The Bill seemed to us a thoroughly fair and honest attempt to remove whatever could be justly alleged as a grievance on the one side, whilst it refused to inflict what would certainly be regarded as a grievance on the other. It was based throughout upon sanitary considerations; there was only one clause, which we will consider presently, that touched the religious-grievance side of the question. Its aim was to close such churchyards as from insufficiency of space or considerations of public health were no longer fit places for burying the dead, and to compel and enable the inhabitants of parishes thus insufficiently furnished to supply what was needed for the decent interment of their dead. It gave to the Local Government Board power to enforce compliance with its requirements, and to Burial Boards or Vestries the duty of carrying out its provisions. It dealt even-handed

justice to Churchmen and Nonconformists, by requiring that in every burying-ground there should be 'a sufficient consecrated and unconsecrated part,' and that whilst a chapel might be provided for Churchmen and another for Nonconformists, the local authority was 'not to provide the one without providing the other, except in pursuance of a special resolution of the burial authority sanctioned by the Local Government Board.' To the local authority was entrusted whatever power was needed to create, sustain, embellish and protect the cemeteries called into existence by the Act. Provision was made for these local bodies to supersede the parish clergyman in certain cases, as it was intended to enact by Clause 36 that 'where a burial-ground has been provided for any parish under the Acts commonly called the Church Building Acts and consecrated, the incumbent of that parish, with the consent of the ordinary and of the burial authority for the district in which such parish, or any part thereof, is situate, may, by writing under his hand and seal, transfer the burial-ground to the burial authority for that district, and thereupon such ground shall be deemed to be the consecrated part of a burial-ground acquired by the burial authority under this Act.' Under this clause, therefore, it would seem that a churchyard as well as consecrated ground at a distance from the church might be transferred to the Burial Board; only the Bill did not enable such Board to permit the service in the consecrated portion of the ground to be performed by Nonconformists. This 36th Clause, as well as the whole tenor of the Bill, shows that if it had become an Act it would have rendered it impossible to add to the Church's own burying-grounds for the future, except by the voluntary contributions of her own members. The provision of burial-grounds by the Church, and the possible absorption of some of those which she possessed by the local burial authority, would, in some important respects, have resembled the provision concerning the possible transfer of Voluntary Schools to School Boards made by the Education Act of 1870.

Only one clause, the 74th, in any way affected the existing law with regard to the religious rites to be used at the grave; we cannot say that it altered it, as it is doubtful whether the authority which it professes to give does not already exist. It provided that where the relative or person taking upon himself the duty of providing for the burial of a deceased person might request it, 'the burial shall be permitted to take place in the churchyard without the performance therein of the burial service of the Church of England.' The avowed

object of this clause being that relatives in charge of the funeral may 'represent that the religious service or ceremony will be performed elsewhere.'

The only doubt that could be raised about the wisdom of the measure, from a Churchman's point of view, lay in the insertion of this 74th clause. It is open to question whether it was necessary, as Lord Redesdale urged, on going into Committee, as there is certainly no law to prevent a body being buried in silence, whilst there is a law permitting suicides to be so interred. If the clause was not necessary, it might be said that it raised a religious question, which otherwise might have been avoided. For our own part, we attach little weight to this consideration, for the question was certain to be raised after the previous discussions in both Houses of Parliament; after the attempts which had been ineffectually made shortly before the Bill was introduced into Parliament by a few clergymen of the Evangelical School, in conjunction with an equal number of Nonconformist ministers, to strike out the terms of a possible compromise; and more especially because it promised to create a difficulty for the Government, which the Opposition was not likely to overlook. We think, therefore, that the Government did well to show its readiness to concede whatever it felt in honour could be conceded, by allowing the Nonconformists to bury their dead in the churchyards of the Church of England, in the same manner that their brethren, of the various bodies of Presbyterians and others, are wont to bury their dead in Scotland, where the graveyards are, in a measure, under the care of a Presbyterian church, though provided by, and the property of, the heritors.

It was evident from the first that the measure would have to encounter vigorous opposition. No sooner was it announced than the whole Nonconformist world was in a flutter. Every sect was aroused to pour its anathemas upon a Bill which did not concede all that the Liberation Society had demanded. Large and important meetings of ministers and leading laymen were summoned for the purpose; small and unimportant meetings were invited to add their voices to the chorus. Public meetings were held by the Liberation Society to denounce the Bill as an insult to the whole Nonconformist body, and to express in unmeasured terms that they would be satisfied with nothing but the complete surrender of all that they demanded. If any had hoped that the Bill would be regarded as a healing measure by some, whose interests it was supposed in some degree to promote, they must certainly have been disappointed, as we believe that, without an exception, every

section of the Protestant nonconforming community expressed its dissatisfaction with what was proposed.

After such an outpouring of discontent at the Government Bill, it was only to be expected that the Liberal leaders in Parliament should challenge its passage when it came to a second reading. Accordingly, on April 13, Lord Granville, as leader of the Opposition in the House of Lords, gave notice that when the second reading was moved he should propose as an amendment the following resolution:—

‘That no amendment of the law relating to the burial of the dead in England will be satisfactory, which does not enable the relatives or friends having charge of the funeral of any deceased person to conduct such funeral in any churchyard in which the deceased had a right of interment, with such Christian and orderly religious observances as to them may seem fit.’

This amendment was discussed on April 26, when the Bill was read a second time, by 141 to 102. The debate was chiefly remarkable for the speeches of the two Archbishops and Lord Harrowby. The Archbishop of Canterbury expressed some satisfaction with the principle of a silent service. With it he thought the Established, the Free, and the United Presbyterian Churches of Scotland should, at all events, be content, as their book of discipline sets forth, that for the avoiding of all inconvenience—

‘We judge it best that neither singing nor reading be at a burial; for, although it may admonish some of the living to prepare themselves for death, yet it is the view of some superstitious persons that the singing and the reading of the living may benefit the dead. Therefore, we think it most expedient that the dead be conveyed to the place of burial without singing or reading, yea, without all kinds of ceremonies hitherto used, and that they be committed to the grave with gravity and sobriety.’

But his Grace’s special objection to the Bill was, that it made no provision for the Christian burial of the unbaptized. He said, ‘I do not, however, despair, because I have full confidence that it is a change which the good sense of the Church of England would approve—that there shall be, in the case of persons who die unbaptized through no fault of their own, some means provided by which the minister of religion presiding over the parish may be enabled to commit their bodies to the grave with such consolatory words as their friends may desire uttered over their remains.’

The Archbishop of York, whilst expressing his intention to vote for the second reading, showed that his sympathies were

with Lord Granville's amendment. He was anxious to have the question settled, and he thought this was more likely to be accomplished by reading the Bill a second time, and amending it in Committee, and therefore he reserved any opposition he might wish to offer to it until that stage. At the same time he insisted, with truth, that the clergy have a grievance in being compelled to read the service over all who are brought to them, and this he thought should be considered. Lord Harrowby desired 'to reconcile the basis of the Established Church with the circumstances of the population; but he did not believe that the Bill before the House offered the slightest prospect of a solution of the difficulty; whilst voting for the second reading, he promised that if no one else should come forward to move an amendment to the 74th clause, he would do so.' The debate was certainly untoward for the future prospects of the Bill; it revealed a large amount of opposition amongst those who voted for its second reading, which seemed to render it doubtful whether the crucial test of Committee could be safely borne.

On May 17, the House of Lords went into Committee on the Bill. The consolidating clauses were rapidly passed; all went smoothly till the 74th clause was reached, when the Archbishop of Canterbury moved the following amendment:

'In cases when the Burial Service of the Church of England cannot lawfully be used, but where it shall appear to the incumbent or curate in charge desirable to use some religious service, and the person having charge of the interment shall desire the same, it shall be lawful for the minister, if he shall think fit, to use any service authorised by the Bishop, provided that nothing except hymns shall be introduced into such service, which does not form part of the Holy Scriptures or of the Book of Common Prayer, for such cases; provided that notice shall be sent to the Bishop within seven days of any such use of the said service, by the person using the same. In cases where the Burial Service of the Church of England might lawfully be used, but where the person having charge of the interment shall request that the said service, authorised by the Bishop as aforesaid, shall be used instead of the Burial Service of the Church of England, the minister shall not be subject to any penalty for omitting to use the service of the Church of England, and for using the said authorised service in lieu thereof, provided that, in any such case, he shall report the facts of the case to the Bishop within seven days, and provided that the Bishop shall thereupon approve the said omission and substitution by writing under his hand.'

This amendment was carried by 65 to 60, the two Archbishops and the Bishops of London, Winchester, Carlisle, Exeter, Hereford, Llandaff, Oxford, and Salisbury, and Lords

Harrowby, Middleton, and Cottesloe voting in the majority with the Opposition; the minority consisting of the usual supporters of Government, with the Bishops of Bath and Wells, Chichester, Ely, Lichfield, Lincoln, Peterborough, and Rochester.

The Archbishop of York then proposed as a second amendment—

‘No incumbent or curate of the Church of England shall, after the passing of this Act, be liable to any penalty for refusing or omitting to perform the Burial Service of the Church at the funeral of any deceased person, if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the Bishop that in such refusal or omission he acted under a reasonable belief that scandal and offence would be occasioned to the parishioners by the use of the said service; provided that in every such case it shall be the duty of the minister declining to perform such service, if he would otherwise be required in law to perform it, to give notice of his refusal to the relatives or persons taking upon them the duty of providing for the burial of such deceased person, in such a manner and within such time as to enable proper provision to be made for such burial; provided further, that in case of such refusal it shall be lawful for any other minister of the Church, beneficed or licensed in any diocese, who may be willing to do so, to read the Burial Service of the Church at the burial of such deceased person in any churchyard in which the deceased person had at the time of his death a right of interment; provided also, that the incumbent or curate so refusing shall at the time transmit a statement of such refusal, and of the grounds thereof, to the Bishop of the diocese, who shall thereupon declare to the said incumbent or curate, in writing, whether it has or has not been shown to his satisfaction that there were reasonable grounds for such refusal.’

This clause, being apparently supported only by Lord Selborne and its proposer, was negatived without a division.

There is one objection common to the clauses moved by the two Archbishops to which we would call attention in passing. Both seem to regard the Church as a congeries of individuals, not an organised living body. Whilst, therefore, they are anxious to protect the consciences of individuals, they fail to see that the conscience of the Church may be offended by some of its members acting in one way and some in another upon a matter about which she had recently legislated. Thus the Archbishop of Canterbury provides a second service, to be read when the present Burial Office of the Church cannot legally be read; but then it can only be employed when the minister in charge ‘shall think fit,’ so that in two (possibly adjoining) parishes, under identical circumstances, the service would be read in one and refused in the other. In many

things we are far from desiring rigid uniformity ; but in a matter of discipline like this, which will certainly arouse a good deal of feeling, it does seem to us very desirable that clergymen should have a positive law laid down for their guidance, and that the action of the Church should be uniform. It might sometimes require obedience which some would rather not render ; but at others it would furnish protection for which all would be grateful. The Archbishop of York, in his proposal, goes farther than this. He proposes that in cases when it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Bishop that 'scandal and offence would be occasioned to the parishioners by the use' of the Burial Office of the Church, no minister shall be liable to any penalty for refusing to read such office ; but then he proceeds to enact 'that in case of such refusal it shall be lawful for any other minister of the Church, beneficed or licensed in any diocese, who may be willing to do so, to read the burial service of the Church at the burial of such deceased person.' That is, when the Bishop and the parish priest concur in thinking that 'scandal and offence' would be created by reading the Burial Service, nevertheless the friends of a rich sinner are to be authorised by law to bribe some hireling priest to read the service, and thereby create a scandal and offence to the parishioners. Surely, in both cases, the loss to the Church would be greater, and is of far more moment, than the gain to individuals. Whilst, therefore, we think something needs to be done in the case brought forward by the Archbishop of York, we should exceedingly deprecate his Grace's remedy.

But to proceed with Lord Harrowby's amendment, which was next proposed in the following words :

'When the relative, or other person having charge of the funeral of a person dying in any parish or having had a right of interment in any parish, shall signify in writing to the incumbent of such parish, or to the curate in charge of the same, that it is his desire that the burial of such person shall take place without the Burial Service of the Church of England, the said relative or person shall thereupon be at liberty to inter the deceased with such Christian and orderly religious services at the grave as he shall think fit, or without any religious service ; provided that all regulations as to the position and making of the grave which would be in force in the case of a person interred with the service of the Church of England shall be in force as to such interment ; provided further, that notice of the time when it is the wish of the relatives or other persons, as aforesaid, to conduct the said interment shall be given to the incumbent or curate in charge, at latest some time the day before ; provided further, that the said interment shall not take place at the time of, or within half an hour before or after,

any service in the church, or of any funeral already appointed in the churchyard. If any person shall in any churchyard use any observance or ceremony, or deliver any address not permitted by this Act, or otherwise, or by any lawful authority, or be guilty of any disorderly conduct or conduct calculated to provoke a breach of the peace, or shall under colour of any religious observance, or otherwise, in any churchyard, wilfully endeavour to bring into contempt or obloquy the Christian religion, or the belief or worship of any church or denomination of Christians, or the ministers or any minister of any such church or denomination, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.'

This clause failed to be carried in Committee, an equal number of votes (102) appearing for and against it, those in its favour including amongst them the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of Oxford and Exeter. But upon the bringing up of the report on June 18, the clause was accepted by 127 voices in its favour to 111 against it.

This proved fatal to the Bill. On June 21 the Duke of Richmond and Gordon announced—

'That since Monday last he had consulted his colleagues as to the course which should be adopted with regard to the Burials Bill, and they had come to the conclusion that the amendment of Lord Harrowby was so opposed to the general scheme of the Bill, and would so entirely disarrange the principle on which it was founded, that it was incumbent on the Government to withdraw the measure. During the recess they should give the whole subject their attentive consideration.'

Such is the present position of affairs. We have thought it best to remind our readers of the facts as briefly as possible, and now we must address ourselves to the much more difficult task of considering what ought to be done. It is not easy to conceive a more anxious state of affairs, or one in which it behoves all who write or speak about it to weigh well their words. At such a time, to speak with passion or prejudice may imperil interests which we greatly value, whilst to forbear to say what we honestly believe would be cowardly in the extreme. Let us then begin by looking the situation fairly in the face. Two amendments have been carried in the House of Lords—the branch of the legislature likely to be most favourable to the Church—which would materially alter the present law with respect to the burial of the dead and the tenure of our churchyards. One of these amendments was proposed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and supported by the Archbishop of York; the other was defended by one of our Primates, and not opposed by the other; whilst the leading

Peers of one of the schools of thought in the Church—such as Lords Shaftesbury, Harrowby, Chichester, Ebury, Middleton—irrespective of political party, voted for one or both of them. These amendments were carried in full houses; the later one, after every effort had been made to secure a good division by both sides, and after some weeks had been allowed to elapse, during which the subject had been most industriously ventilated. We fear, therefore, that we must begin by admitting that the tone of the House of Lords must be regarded as expressed by the last division, and that whilst it would be exaggerating the danger to despair of a more favourable division after a longer consideration of the question, nevertheless the probabilities are that next session would show the feeling in the Upper House unchanged. Possibly the most hopeful feature may be found in the fact that little more than one-half of the Peers voted—238 out of 474. But much cannot be built upon this, as it is obvious that if they had had a clear view on the question they would have voted. Moreover, there is the further possibility that the sympathies of those who did not vote were not in accordance with those of their party, and if that party should be the party of the Government, it would make the matter worse.

It may help us to determine the course which should be taken with respect to the two amendments carried in the House of Lords, and the possibility of an arrangement being arrived at for their settlement, if we examine the grounds on which they are urged, and the reasons set forth by their promoters to secure their adoption. A careful examination of the debate will show that the one ground on which every argument rests is that the churchyards are places in which all parishioners have a legal right to be buried, and therefore it is a grievance if they are not allowed to be buried there in the manner they or their friends would like best. The way in which the grievance is dressed up varies according to the art or prepossessions of the speaker; but this is the assumption which underlies every appeal for a change of the law where it is not distinctly stated. Lord Granville is content to assume it, and he would have none of the Bill proposed by the Government because it does not satisfy the demands of the Nonconformists. The Archbishop of Canterbury expressed a hope that the grievance in this matter might, in part at least, be removed by some alteration of the law as it affects the existing service of the Church of England. "I hold," he says, "that one who is desirous of being buried in the churchyard of the Church of England, and who has no

conscientious objection to the service of the Church of England, is entitled to be buried with the service of the Church of England.' In other words, he actually claims for the unbaptized the *right* to enjoy the service provided by the Church for her own members. He seems to forget that baptism admits into the fold of the Church, and that, however excellent and admirable persons unbaptized may be, it is not the office of the Church to make provision for their burial rites. The case is different with those who have been admitted within her pale, however unworthy they may be, if she has not expelled them from her communion. And though it is certain that much of the present difficulty springs from the scandals which have arisen from burying notorious evil lives, and from the felt unsuitableness of our burial office to many over whom it is read; still it must be remembered that for them the Church is bound to make provision. They have been made members of her body, and for some reason she has not thought well to sunder the connexion. But for those not admitted, or severed from her ranks, she has no such obligation. Her responsibility is to Churchmen, not to British subjects. And though she may be content to assume, in the absence of positive proof to the contrary, as in the case of persons found drowned on the sea shore, that they are Churchmen, she is not bound to act as if this were the case, when she has positive proof to the contrary. Nay, all sense of her own true position forbids such a course of action. It was forgetfulness of this that led to the Archbishop's resolution. He evidently takes for granted that English Churchmen and English citizens are convertible terms. It is upon this confusion of thought that his amendment depends for its justification. If the Church is bound to make provision for 'all the subjects of the Queen,' then much may be said in its favour, though then the present position would be obviously most unsuitable; but if the Church has only to take order for those who are her members, then the case is quite different. The assumption which the other speakers were content to make tacitly Lord Selborne asserts explicitly. 'You must not forget,' he says, 'that the law gives the Dissenters the right which this Bill does not take away—of interment in churchyards. Even where there are cemeteries, there may be many persons whose relatives and friends rest in the churchyard, and who would desire at their death to lie beside them, and it would be no answer to them to say, "You cannot have your legal right in the churchyard, your body cannot be laid here beside the bodies of your wife and children otherwise than by the

service of the Church or by silent burial. But you may go to the cemetery somewhere else, and have the interment performed religiously after your manner there."

This, then, is the one point upon which the whole controversy turns, that the Dissenters have a grievance, because having a right as parishioners to be buried in a churchyard, they cannot exercise that right in whatever manner they please. But here we note a confusion between two things which ought not to be confounded. An unconditional right is one thing, a conditional right is another. In the former case any bar to the enjoyment of the right becomes an injustice; in the latter, the right has no existence until the conditions are complied with. This is obvious enough in other matters, and we contend that it is equally so here. The law gives a man a right to be buried in the churchyard; well, it gives him also a right to use the Queen's highway; but no one would say that he had a grievance because he was debarred from using such highway through a refusal to obey the byelaws issued for its management, such as driving in the carriage-road, and not on the footpath: and observing the common-law uses as to the vehicles he might meet or pass. And there are reasons for observing existing conditions as to the use of our churchyards, stronger than for observing them with respect to the use of our highways, and this is set forth by the fact that the freehold of the churchyards is vested, not in the Queen or in any central civil authority, for the equal use of all the parishioners upon the same terms, but in the parson of the parish, as guardian of the distinctive rights of the Church of which he is the minister.

Moreover, it is equally obvious to say that if the law gives every parishioner a right to be buried in the churchyard, it also gives every parishioner a right to worship in his parish church; and, as a matter of argument, we do not see how it can be successfully maintained that it is a violation of religious liberty to insist upon the maintenance of the conditions under which the first of these rights has hitherto been enjoyed, and yet no infringement of it to maintain them with regard to the second. The truth is the same in both cases: the law which gives a right to interment in a churchyard prescribes the conditions under which that right may be exercised, just as the law prescribes the conditions under which the parishioners may worship in their parish church. The right and the conditions go hand in hand. The right to be buried in the churchyard is a legal, not a natural right, and it exists only on the conditions laid down by the law. We may go further.

We presume that when a Nonconformist chapel is licensed for public worship, it is open to all who may desire to take part in its services, it has in a measure lost its private character and has assumed a public one, and therefore it is not free for those who have opened it to admit whom they will and to exclude whom they will. Why then, as all persons have a right to worship there, should not all by the same rule have a right to the kind of worship which they prefer? So again, the law gives to all a right to travel in all public conveyances, why should not the passenger by the same rule have equally a right to dictate the terms on which he will use them, and so to refuse to pay any fare?

And then, with respect to the defence of the Church, if we concede this right to the churchyard, it may be well to remind Lord Selborne that it is difficult to reconcile the urgency with which he insists upon the Dissenter's right to the churchyard with his judgment in relation to the church in the case of Mr. Ridsdale. The freehold of S. Peter's, Folkestone, vests in Mr. Ridsdale as incumbent, and that surely is a right to officiate there, at least as strong as the Dissenter's right to be buried in the churchyard of his parish. Yet Lord Selborne, so far as is known, saw no hardship in assenting to a judgment which would deprive Mr. Ridsdale of the right which he now possesses, and of eventually turning him out of the church of which he is incumbent if he would not comply with the conditions which the law, as laid down by the final Court of Appeal, requires him to fulfil. Why then, from a legal point of view, should the Dissenter's hardship be represented as so very great when, in his case, it arises from a hindrance from entering upon a privilege which he had not previously enjoyed, while in Mr. Ridsdale's case it is asserted to be only common justice that he should lose what he has? For the cause from which both hardships spring is identical—a refusal to observe the conditions attached to the right. And if sentiment or feeling is to have weight in the decision, it is surely a worse thing to be deprived of what we have than to be hindered from obtaining what we have never possessed.

Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the primary idea in providing churchyards was not care or thought for the interment of the 'subjects of the Queen,' but of the faithful members of the Church. As Sir Robert Phillimore expresses it in his *Ecclesiastical Law*, i. 840—

'The right to burial was founded on the dead man having, while alive, been a member of the Christian community; and therefore

infideles, unbelievers, heretics, and their abettors, schismatics, those under an interdict, and the excommunicated, were denied this privilege.'

And then a little further on (p. 842), he gives the reason why the faithful wished for burial in a plot of ground adjoining the Church:—

'The reason given by Gregory the Great why it was more profitable to be buried within the precincts of the church than at a distance, was, because their neighbours, as often as they come to those sacred places, remembering those whose sepulchres they behold, do put forth prayers for them unto God. Which reason was afterwards transferred into the body of the Canon law. And this practice of praying for the dead seems to have been the true origin of churchyards, as encompassing or adjoining to the church; which having been laid out and inclosed for the common burial-places of the respective parishioners, every parishioner has, and always had, a right to be buried in them.'

We do not suppose that either the Archbishop or Lord Selborne would hold that the Dissenters would suffer a grievance because they were deprived of what was held in the days of Gregory the Great to be a special privilege of the faithful. As the grievance for the removal of which they plead is not based upon any proposed encroachment by the clergy upon rights or privileges hitherto enjoyed by Nonconformists, so neither can it be founded upon their fear of being deprived of what those who dedicated our ancient churchyards looked upon as the special profit and advantage of being buried in them.

As this ancient ecclesiastical view would be scouted as the basis on which to rest the grievance, on what must it be built? We feel assured that Lord Selborne is too much wedded to the mysteries of his craft to generalise and to apply to all things indiscriminately what he asserts so strongly about the burial laws, and yet upon what defensible principle can he make the application of a general rule a grievance in one case, and no grievance in all others, more especially when the law from time immemorial has placed them all on the same footing? No doubt Lord Selborne, in his extensive practice, has met with many lifeholders of entailed estates, of settled annuities, of pensions and other advantages, who exceedingly dislike the conditions with which their possession is burdened. They would very much wish to exchange their life-tenures for a freehold, or to convert their land into money, or to invest their capital in securities which bear a higher interest, or to trade with the capital; but, how-

ever strongly such persons might feel the restrictions which hindered their making the changes they desired, we cannot suppose that the late Lord Chancellor would generalize the grievance of which he is the able exponent, and apply the principle universally which he seeks to enforce with respect to one kind of trust property. And yet, if it be a grievance for a man to be bound by the conditions under which a privilege is provided for him in the one case, we need some proof to show that it is not a grievance in the other, or *vice versa*. And we think that it may be found that more interests are imperilled by thus getting rid of conditions, unpleasant to those who are bound by them, than is contemplated by the advocates of the relaxation now under discussion.

Or perhaps Lord Selborne would limit the application of his principle, and say that it should affect only those things which relate to religion, and when conscience may be pleaded. If so, on what basis are we to found our arguments for the retention of our churches, if we concede what he asks with respect to our churchyards? The right with respect to the two is thus laid down by Sir Robert Phillimore:—

‘And, although the freehold of the body of the church be in the incumbent thereof, and the seats be fixed to the freehold; yet because that the church is dedicated to the service of God, and is for the use of the inhabitants, and the seats are erected for their more convenient attendance upon Divine Service, the use of them is common to all the people that pay to the repair thereof.’—*Ecclesiastical Law*, ii. 1798.

‘It is clear by the common law the Rector has the freehold in the churchyard, qualified undoubtedly by the rights of the parishioners, but he may bring an action for trespass if his rights be unjustly invaded.’—*Ibid.* p. 1779.

If the Nonconformists when dead suffer a wrong and a grievance, because they cannot have what service they like, performed by whomsoever they like, in the churchyard, how is it possible to deny, if the legal rights of the parishioners are correctly laid down by Sir Robert Phillimore, that they suffer a like wrong when they are alive, in not being able to have what service they like, performed by whomsoever they like, in the church? There must be a common answer to both, as a matter of mere reasoning, and to us that answer seems plain. It is, that neither church nor churchyard was provided for the parishioners to use according to their own private fancies, but for securing to them the teaching of the Church whilst they were alive, and burial by the Church when they were dead. And that if they did not care to have the one or the other on the terms proposed,

they thereby failed to acquire all the rights and advantages which they might otherwise have enjoyed.

But we have not yet discovered in what the grievance consists. Lord Granville makes an appeal to civil and religious liberty, as though to refuse what Dissenters ask was a violation of that principle. Surely he uses the words in a sense quite different to what he employed them when a young man. Then civil and religious liberty was taken to mean that religious opinions should not debar from political privileges or hinder a man from worshipping God as he thought best, in a place that he might provide for the purpose. But now he would apply it to a case where no civil liberty of the complainant is threatened, and where his religious liberty is absolutely unfettered, if only he will be content to enjoy it without violating what others feel to be their civil and religious liberty. Why should Nonconformists have a right to interfere with Churchmen's possession of burial-grounds, which have been secured to them by a solemn religious dedication as well as by immemorial custom and by legislation, and if they are denied the pleasure of invading the cherished and time-honoured possessions of men of a different faith to their own, turn round and say that their civil and religious liberty is interfered with? If this argument should hold, it is obvious that a man's civil liberty must equally include a right to his share of the freehold land of the country, now held by a tenure, in many respects more open to assault than that of the Church to her churchyards. If landowners would feel that their liberty would be interfered with by their land being divided amongst all that would wish for a share of it, Churchmen may feel the same with respect to their churchyards. And it must be remembered that the land was in the first instance allotted by the King, as head of the State, to be held for the benefit of the service of the State; just as in the other instance the churchyards were solemnly dedicated to God for the benefit of the parishioners who died in communion with the Church. If the terms of the tenure in the latter case are to be abrogated, because persons are found who claim their share, whilst they refuse to observe the conditions to which their right to make the claim is attached; what is there to hinder others from insisting that the terms of the tenure in the other case shall be narrowly scrutinised, and from claiming that either the terms of the original grant shall be fulfilled in the spirit in which they were imposed, or else that the power which granted the land upon conditions shall resume its grant when those conditions have not been fully observed? We believe it is

best for all parties in the State that things should remain as they are. We exceedingly deprecate any interference with the present received principles as to the possession of property. But we are satisfied that if these principles are ruthlessly trampled upon in so serious a matter as the Church's right to her churchyards, the breach cannot stop there. Every land-owner in the country will probably in the course of a few years feel the force of the flood, when this gate is opened for its discharge; and those who consent to apply the principle to the property of others, will surely not expect much sympathy when it comes in turn to be applied to their own possessions. Moreover, as a further objection to the proposed alienation, we know no reason why Churchmen have not as much right to their civil and religious liberty as Nonconformists to theirs, and they would certainly feel that it was interfered with if their present rights in their churchyards were taken from them. This has apparently been overlooked by those who assume or assert that the Nonconformists have a grievance in the matter of their burials.

We are satisfied, then, that the basis on which the alleged grievance rests is one that will not bear to be critically examined. The principle contained in that basis, if logically carried out, would be destructive of all conditions upon the enjoyment of any privileges, and subversive of the tenure by which much of the property of the country is held, and of many of its institutions. We are quite aware that it has already been applied to the fund provided by the piety of our ancestors for the maintenance of the fabrics of our churches, and to some other of the Church's possessions. The confiscation of our churchyards would be another application of the same principle; the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church another; the confiscation of the rights of present owners of land for the benefit of the State another. We cannot say that we so admire what has been done, or what may possibly follow in logical sequence, as to be willing to assent to the application.

But though it may be impossible to show that by the present laws affecting the burial of the dead in her churchyards, the Church inflicts any wrong or hardship upon the Nonconformists, it is perfectly possible that change of circumstances may have created inconveniences which call for legislative remedy. We wish to judge of this matter with strict impartiality, and to deal out to others what we should wish to have dealt out to ourselves if the position was reversed.

If we, or any of those whom we love, were to die in a country where there are only burial-grounds connected with Roman Catholic churches, or in Scotland where there are only burial-grounds connected with the Established Kirk, what should we wish for ourselves and our belongings? We can truly say that the last place in which we should wish to claim a right of sepulture would be the burial-ground in either case. What we should desire would be to lie amongst our own people, those who had held the same faith with ourselves when they were alive, and all that we should ask for would be some spot safe from desecration where our ashes might be undisturbed till the day of doom. Let such a place be secured to us, and we should be quite satisfied; let us be able there to have the service appointed by our own Church, and we should feel that there was nothing more for which we could ask.

Feeling this, we turn to the case of the Nonconformists at home, and we find that there are places where they cannot have those privileges, which we recognise to be as much their right as our own, and therefore we would say, wherever they do not exist, let them be supplied. There was a time when all Englishmen belonged to one Church, and when all were content to receive the same burial rites. Long since then, when divisions abounded, the greater number of people had no other desire than that when they died they should be buried with the service of the Church in the churchyard. Those who entertained a different feeling, and markedly members of the Society of Friends, provided burial-grounds for themselves. There are hundreds, we might say thousands, of such burial-grounds in different parts of England and Wales. What member of the Church of England has ever wished to violate the sanctity of these resting-places of the dead, or to disturb the peace of their guardians by asking that he might be buried within their precincts, with the service of the Church of England? As Churchmen would require that within reach of the places where there are such burial-grounds there should be opportunity given to them to be interred according to the rites of their own Church, so we readily concede, nay we would gladly urge, that in every place the Nonconformists should have a right to a like provision for their dead. The great increase in the population, and possibly the intensifying of what is sometimes termed the 'dissidence of dissent,' have led to a claim being made for this right, of which our forefathers heard nothing. And as the claim has been made, by all means let it be satisfied, not by encroaching upon the rights of others, but by providing a new place of sepulture in which those

others shall have no rights. If the churchyard suffices for the needs of the Church people, then let a Nonconformist burying-ground be secured in the most fitting place, and in such a manner as will best meet the wishes of those for whose benefit it is intended. Let this be done at the general expense; Churchmen would not object to contribute their rateable proportion. For as the law secures to each parishioner a right to be buried within his parish, so the true recognition of the requirements of religious liberty demands that each parishioner should be buried with such religious rites as he would prefer. If, therefore, some parishioners object to the religious rites which are and ever have been the condition on which persons have a claim to be interred in the churchyards, then by all means let another place be provided to which no such conditions are attached, and where any one will be at liberty, within reasonable limits, to follow the rules and ordinances of the religious or non-religious body to which he may belong. But do not let the religious liberty of those who value the consecration of our churchyards, and their exclusive use by persons buried with the Church's services, be trespassed upon by others who despise the consecration of the ground, and wholly reject the service appointed to be read in it. An equal measure of liberty Churchmen would freely concede. But when they propose it they are met with two objections—the first that such a plan would ticket people in death as Churchmen or Nonconformists. Surely what a man tickets himself in life, he cannot object to being ticketed in death, if we must use a word which has not been introduced by ourselves into the controversy, and to which we object as an unfair mode of describing the differences between Church and Dissent. We cannot imagine an earnest Nonconformist who on every Sunday in his life attended the Baptist, or Congregational, or Methodist Chapel saying—‘I should like to be so buried when I die that no one should ever know that I had not been a Churchman.’ The same convictions, which we must assume to be conscientious, that led him, when alive, to separate from the Church, we should imagine would make him feel that there could be no grievance when he was dead in having such separation marked. It is not Church people who have severed themselves from Nonconformists, but Nonconformists from Church people. They must be supposed to have separated themselves for a reason which they felt to be of vital importance. They thought the doctrines of the Church erroneous, or its ministers less spiritual and edifying, or its people less

godly, than were to be found amongst the sect to which they joined themselves. Why, then, should they hold it to be a grievance that the position which they chose for themselves in life, and which from their point of view we must assume to be one of superiority, should be marked when they are dead?

But there is a second objection, which is now more generally insisted upon. It is said there is a strong natural sentiment which leads men to desire that their bodies, when dead, should lie in the same ground with those of the persons they loved when upon earth. In considering this objection we have to ask which is the hardship that you really mean—the prohibition to lie beside wife or children, which is one thing, or the being hindered from introducing strange ministers with unaccustomed rites into the churchyards, which is quite another? If the former be the real grievance, Churchmen are willing to remove it by saying, as the Government Bill of last session said, ‘You need not be excluded from our churchyards, from lying beside wife or children, even though you so dislike the Burial Office of the Church of England that you will not allow it to be read over your body; by all means follow the custom of the Presbyterians in Scotland, and let there be whatever service you would prefer in your own house before the funeral cortège starts; or, if you think better, let your body be taken to the chapel where you worshipped when you were alive, and let the minister, from whose lips you listened to that religious teaching which you preferred, say over your body that service you desiderate, and then let your body be silently laid to rest beside those whom you loved.’ Nay, most Churchmen say, ‘If you would still wish for some service in the churchyard, we are willing to have a second service prepared, in which shall be found none of the sentences with which you find fault in our present office, nothing to which you can conscientiously object.’ So far, then, as the sentimental wish to lie in the churchyard beside those whom they loved on earth is concerned, Church people are willing to remove difficulties if they exist, and to make it quite possible for those who object to our rites to obtain what they desire without submitting to them.

We are satisfied that the more the question is considered, the more it will be found that it is not objections to a silent funeral, or the Church’s service, or the ministrations of the clergyman, which constitute the grievance which the Non-conformists are labouring to remove. All these things, as we have shown, might be surmounted; for the removal of whatever could be called a grievance in any of these things

the Church is ready to provide. What is wanted by those who agitate for a change in the law is to assert the equal right of Nonconformist ministers to conduct services in the churchyards, and if in the churchyards then in the churches belonging to the Established Church. It is the same question which was substantially settled in 1662, which is now being revived. Then the doubt was whether those ministers who had not been ordained by a bishop should be reckoned as ministers of the Church of England, and be allowed to retain their cures; now it is, shall those who have not been episcopally ordained be placed on the same footing in our churchyards with those whose orders were derived from bishops? However the question may be smoothed over, we are satisfied that is the actuating motive with the chief promoters of the agitation. The claim is not made in words, amongst other reasons, possibly, because the small secular wing of the party clamouring for change would have no sympathy with it; and the attacking army must be kept together till the bastion is carried. Moreover, the question has become a political one, and many join in the onslaught upon our churchyards on political and not on religious grounds, and to some of them the announcement that this was the point aimed at would be displeasing.

Throughout, we have argued this question as though it were concerned mainly with the person allowed to officiate in our churchyards. We have done so because we are satisfied that this is the crucial point of the question. Surrender this, and the Nonconformists will make light of any other difficulties which they have raised, at all events for the present. Give up this, and Churchmen generally would say that there is nothing left worth fighting for. The reason for this is obvious. The clergyman claims to have the sole right of officiating because the churchyard is vested in him, and therefore, he maintains, belongs to the Church and not to the State; and he also maintains that the two are not identical. The Nonconformist insists upon his right to officiate within the consecrated enclosure, because he affirms that the churches and all that appertain to them are national property; so that the Church must either have never had an existence independent of the State, or, if she had, she must have lost it. The clergyman, therefore, on his hypothesis refuses to recognise that his right to minister in church or churchyard comes from the civil authority; he asserts that neither church nor churchyard ever belonged to the State; and that its ownership stands in the same relation to the State as any other proprietary.

rights. He recognises the power of the State to dispossess the Church, or alienate her property, just as he recognises its power to do the same with all other property. The State laid violent hands on Church property in periods that may be called revolutionary, such as the Reformation. It did the same with the rights of individual proprietors in other revolutionary periods, such as the Norman Conquest and the Wars of the Roses; and we have yet to learn that in the Great Rebellion lay 'malignants' and their estates were exempted from suffering and confiscation, any more than were the clergy and the property of which they were the trustees. If, therefore, the State chooses to pass a law which shall strip the Church of her churches and churchyards, there is no power which can resist it; but likewise, if it chooses to pass a law, that when a man dies his estate shall be equally divided amongst his children, or amongst the householders in his parish, or be confiscated to the State, there is no one who would say that it does not possess the power. The clergy regard Lord Harrowby's resolution very much as Lord Harrowby would regard a law relating to landed estate of the kind just indicated. The Liberationist view is quite different to this. He holds that churches and churchyards and endowments are national property; that the nation has therefore a right to entrust them to other hands if it chooses to do so; that, as the privileges of the Church in other ways have been abridged, so they may be with respect to churchyards. In the person, therefore, who has a right to minister in the churchyard each side sees the representative of the principle for which it contends. To the Churchman the Liberationist seems to be advocating the overthrow of rights of property, and he is satisfied that each concession of the principle brings us nearer to a catastrophe. To the Liberationist the Churchman seems to be contending for the exclusive enjoyment of privileges which belong to the nation at large. In such a conflict of views there can be no compromise. It does not therefore seem to us desirable to discuss proposals for settling this question emanating from Churchmen which do not grapple with this point. Thus, for instance, it has been proposed to close all the churchyards in the country, and to begin everywhere afresh with cemeteries, in which the two parties may be placed upon an absolute equality. But, self-denying as this suggestion is, we fear that it would not satisfy. If there is any truth in what Lord Selborne asserts, that people are anxious to be buried near their departed friends (and we are far from denying it), then it would be

sorry comfort to the Nonconformist to say to him, 'You need not mind being unable to gratify this wish, for you are as well off as the Churchman;' nor could we expect Churchmen, who valued the privilege, contentedly to acquiesce in its surrender, more especially if it would not satisfy opponents. Whilst in some country parishes, where there is still much unused space in the churchyards, strong objections would be raised against providing a new cemetery for Church people. With regard to all these proposals, we should say it is waste of time to consider them until we know that they will content those for whose satisfaction they are intended. So far as we know of the controversy on the Nonconformist side, it has been made to hang entirely upon the one point, the admission of those who represent them to officiate in our churchyards. For Churchmen, under these circumstances, to discuss plans of conciliation is certainly misleading. It may give the impression that with a little more pressure they will consent to yield the special point in dispute. Until this is settled, therefore, we would advise as little distraction as possible to side issues; only let it be distinctly understood that we are willing to yield whatever in honour we can to satisfy the fair wishes and even the prejudices of those who have raised this controversy.

It may be well for us to remember that as those who are contending for a change in the tenure of our churchyards are influenced by a variety of motives, so there is no doubt that this would considerably modify the logical consequences which might be expected to result from the seizure of our burial-grounds. In each step of depriving the Church of her ancient rights and possessions people see danger to themselves, from fear of which they become defenders against further assaults. So probably it would be in this case. Many say that they look at the whole question from a practical point of view, and they have nothing to do with the underlying principles which others imagine to be involved. To them it seems that to admit others besides the clergy to officiate in our churchyards would create no great disturbance of interests, that it would simply remove what is felt to be a grievance by one portion of the community, whilst it really would inflict little or no injury upon any other. But whilst arguing thus with respect to churchyards, they would speak very differently of the churches and their endowments. These have in their eyes an element of personal possession about them, which the others have not. If the churchyards are used by Nonconformists, they would say the clergy and Church people would

be no poorer. They would have what they now have, and others would have a share too. Fallacious and shortsighted as this is, it is the popular feeling which creates danger. People will for the most part refuse to see that there is a logical force in events, as well as in arguments, and that events tend steadily and certainly to their natural conclusions, at least as certainly as do arguments. But all parties see that to deprive Church people of their churches, and of the endowments by which their clergy are maintained, would be a violent interference with the rights of private property. It would begin with the Church, but it could not stop there. Landed estates would speedily follow, and, at a very early date, the Monarchy would fall too. Whilst, then, for political reasons, many may be willing to disendow the Church of her churchyards, they would shrink from a measure which even they would see might shake the tenure of land and other property, and probably shake monarchical institutions which they value, and so they would refuse to support disestablishment and disendowment, and deride the thought that they were logically bound to further it. It would seem to them a sufficient answer to such an argument that Englishmen guided their actions by the rules of practical common sense, not by logical consistency. But, whilst a surrender of our churchyards would, in point of principle, be only the further development of the course pursued in depriving the Church of church rates and of her universities and endowed schools, there can be no doubt that this last step would be much more keenly felt by the clergy at large, and by a great many Church laymen, than were the previous inroads upon her position as an Established Church. By the mistaken action of many rectors and vestries of old parish churches the way was paved for the destruction of church rates. Interests arose about district churches which Churchmen were unable to adjust; and so, because they were slighted or neglected, the defenders of what had become the exceptional privileges of a minority of the churches in our large towns were assailed in the day of conflict by many who would have been found on the side of the defenders if justice had been done. And then, with regard to our universities and endowed schools, their cause was not felt to be the cause of the nation at large, but only of the privileged portion of it. Moreover, in the case of the endowed schools, so many were found neglecting or inadequately discharging the duty devolving upon them, that it was painfully easy to raise a just cry for their reformation. Their cause was often absolutely indefensible; and this being the case, it

was only what Churchmen might expect, that institutions which they had permitted to become worthless should be removed from their exclusive control. There was, therefore, no enthusiasm in their defence. All felt that something must be done, and we can but regret that in some cases that something has not been more in accordance with what would have been the wishes of their pious founders.

But it is not so with regard to our churchyards. A few town incumbents, content with the feeling that they have no need to concern themselves with the subject because their churchyards have long since been closed, may advocate a policy of surrender and speak lightly of the interest at stake; but this is very far indeed from being the case with the great majority of the clergy, and especially of the country clergy. They see in a way not to be mistaken the point which is at issue, the dangers with which they are threatened, the disquietude and annoyance to which they must expect to be exposed if the Bill for taking from them their present rights should ever become law. This has been unmistakably shown by the action of Convocation, by the proceedings of all the Church conferences during the autumn, by the most decided and unmistakable expression of opinion at the Church Congress at Croydon, to say nothing of that remarkable petition signed by more than 14,450 clergymen at the invitation of the Church Defence Institution. It is only those who really know the clergy who can adequately appreciate the depth and intensity of their feeling on this subject. We think there would be some danger of their acting over again the unwise part played by the Protectionists in 1846, when men of their own political party repealed the Corn Laws, if the Government which they have hitherto generally supported should assist in passing a measure which would be most obnoxious to them. And we have reason to believe that Conservative members of Parliament will find that they have seriously misunderstood the temper of many of their constituents if they think they can safely support a Bill for the practical alienation of our churchyards which the clergy, at all events, regard with unfeigned detestation.

Before concluding we must say a few words about a point which would perpetually be bringing home the grievance inflicted by an Act for throwing open our churchyards. It is said that such an Act would place Churchmen and Nonconformists in a position of equality. This it might effect when each stood beside the grave of one whom he respected; but how would it be as regards others of the parishioners? There

are bad people as well as good in every parish. Some of these bad people call themselves Nonconformists, whilst others profess to be Church people, or boldly declare that they have no religious faith. Such people die as well as others. Who is to bury them? Is the clergyman in all cases to be compelled to officiate at their funerals, whilst Nonconformist preachers are to be left free to officiate or not? or are the Nonconformist ministers to be compellable to bury those of their own sect? Of course if they are, it so far places them in the position of ministers of an established church, and to some extent interferes with the position of the clergy of the Established Church. But this is a small matter, comparatively speaking. If they are not, then an intolerable grievance will be placed upon the clergy, as they will be compellable to bury those persons of the various Nonconformist bodies whom their own ministers have practically excommunicated. But the hardship would be made more intolerable by the different position in which the two sets of men would be placed with regard to the service to be used. The clergyman would be tied to the same service for all. Whether it were the saintly member of his flock, the pattern of all good words and works, or the profligate or adulterer, or Nonconformist excommunicated by his own minister, snatched hastily away without opportunity of repentance, the clergyman must recite the same solemn words of hope and confidence in a joyful resurrection. The Nonconformist, on the other hand, tied by no form or written service, would be able without fear of rebuke to adjust what he said to the circumstances of the case as they appeared to him and to those who stood around the grave. What would be the effect of this on a parish in any notorious case of a special evil liver? How would the clergyman feel under the jibes and sneers which would be freely levelled at him for simply doing what the law ordered him to do, what he felt to be a distressing and painful duty, but which he could not refuse to do without risking temporary or permanent extrusion from his benefice? It is difficult enough now to know how to act with respect to the funeral of some specially notorious sinner suddenly cut off, but how infinitely more so if the churchyard had ceased to have the clergyman for its exclusive minister, and if it could be alleged, as it certainly would be, that the consciences of the clergy were so elastic that they were ready to say anything over anybody, and that we must look to ministers of other denominations for men who really valued truth, and were not afraid to denounce flagrant sin when they met with it!

After what we have said, our readers will not doubt the conclusion at which we have arrived. It seems to us that the question as it now stands admits of no compromise, for all that we can consistently concede our opponents indignantly refuse to accept as a satisfactory adjustment. They will be content with nothing short of absolute surrender. They demand that the clergy shall give up principles to which they are wedded, surrender solemn trusts for which they feel themselves responsible, and admit changes which they look upon as revolutionary in themselves and ruinous to both Church and country in their consequences if carried out.

We have then in sharp contrast the difficulty of resistance and the injury of defeat. It is quite possible that the Church may be unable to resist those who are making the assault upon her burying-grounds, though we are very far from despairing of a successful resistance. It is quite possible that, deserted by some to whom she had a right to look for help and defence, she may at last be unable to maintain what she regards as her legitimate position. Be it so. We shall deeply regret the consequences. But we have yet to learn that when defeat seems probable, or possible, or even inevitable, true wisdom consists in surrender without a contest. Even in such cases it is often better to be beaten than to compromise—to lose everything but honour, rather than to save a few advantages at the expense of honour and self-respect. In our opinion it has more than once been our misfortune in recent years that when defeat has seemed inevitable, our leaders have turned their thoughts to terms of surrender, instead of boldly fighting on to the end, and daring to run the risk of being defeated. A great party is never really beaten until it despairs. Until then it may resolve to win back, in a future hour of strength, that of which it is stripped in a time of weakness. When it despairs, and makes terms of surrender, it not only loses its present, but it destroys its future. It makes it impossible to win back what it cannot now preserve, and generally gets nothing worth having in return for its pusillanimous conduct. Moreover, it is well to remember that in other ways defeat is often better than compromise. The loss of what would be gained by an arrangement is for the most part more than compensated by the sympathy aroused by defeat, and the tendency to reaction which it creates. In this case it might be possible to save by a compromise some recognition of the clergyman's continued right over the freehold of which he would be partially despoiled; but we see no advantage in that. It might be pos-

sible to obtain some restrictions over the persons to officiate in churchyards, and over the services which they might use; but the Church would be in no way a gainer by that, for with the deprivation of her right of control her responsibility ceases. It might be possible to secure more stringent provisions against orations by infidel orators, or the pollutions of atheistic services over the departed friends of unbelievers; but then securities for such advantages would only help to sustain the newly accepted plan in which Churchmen, as Churchmen, have no special interest. As citizens we should all wish to see the sanctity of the resting-places of the dead respected; but we feel, if the necessity arises, that it would be wiser to leave all such arrangements to the good feeling of the country, and not to strive for conditions which would seem to make the Church responsible, while leaving her no power to interfere effectually. We presume that the law would not refuse to Churchmen the right to provide private burial-grounds for themselves, if they still wished to be allowed to have their bodies interred in consecrated ground, where no ministers but their own could officiate; we presume that even the freest application of the principle of 'civil and religious liberty' would not deny them the liberty of purchasing fresh burial-grounds for themselves, at their own cost; a thing which every Dissenter is free to do if he likes. And if the law left only thus much liberty to Churchmen, then it might probably be found in the course of a few years that Churchmen having ceased to bury their dead in the churchyards, Nonconformists would no longer value the right to be buried there, and that thus the prize of victory would lose its charm as soon as it had been secured.

What then should the Government do after the Duke of Richmond's promise to consider the question during the vacation? It seems to us that there are two courses open to it. The one would be to do nothing. Instead of trying to legislate, it might appoint a Commission to investigate the state of existing burying-grounds of all kinds, and so pave the way for a future measure. If the Government refuses to introduce a Bill, we doubt whether any one else could hope to carry their measure through Parliament. When it came to a discussion of the clauses of such a Bill, it is not probable that Mr. Osborne Morgan, Lord Harrowby, and the Archbishops could agree upon what they should be. It was comparatively easy to secure their co-operation for a single assault; it would be difficult to obtain from them the continued support which is required to carry a

Bill through both Houses of Parliament. The other course would be for Government boldly to communicate with the peers who ordinarily support it. Let them offer to include in a Bill any equitable proposals for providing the Nonconformists with burying-grounds, and otherwise meeting what their fair-minded members may regard as a grievance. To lessen the local burden of obtaining such burying-grounds possibly some help might be given out of the Consolidated Fund. But on the question of the ministration of Nonconformists in churchyards they must be unyielding. If the Conservative peers would agree to support such a measure, let the Government boldly introduce their Bill of last year, which in many respects is excellent, with such modifications or additions as may be agreed upon. If the Conservative peers will not support such a measure, then there is no help for it but to wait for a more convenient season. Looking forward, we are not at all sure that the Government could provide better for the next general election than by making such a fair and liberal offer to adjust difficulties which have arisen. Of course, if the Government should not introduce a Bill to settle this question, it will speedily hear of a resolution on the subject from the Opposition in both Houses of Parliament. After what occurred during the last session, there is certain to be a feeling that the Ministry is assailable on this point, and that an attack might precipitate its dissolution. We should have no fears on this head. Conservative peers who voted with Lord Harrowby would not vote against Government on what was intended to be treated as a vote of want of confidence; whilst in the Lower House, even Scotch and Irish Conservative members who might not be able to resist the tendencies of their constituents if there was practical legislation before the House, would not venture to give a vote which all would feel to be injurious to their party. We should therefore have no fear of the result of hostile attacks; nay, we should be inclined to welcome them as likely to strengthen our position. If we look beyond the walls of Parliament to the constituencies, we are equally persuaded that Government would have nothing to fear, if it will only have the courage to follow what ought to be its Conservative instincts. The noisy and extreme men are those who make their voices heard. As yet but few others have spoken. The more quiet members of the various religious bodies do not protest against these extreme utterances when they do not agree with them, but they refuse to support them at the polls; and from what we hear on all sides, we are satisfied that there is a considerable proportion of the Nonconformist laity who do not sympathise with their

ministers, or with those who affect to be the political leaders of their bodies in their treatment of this matter. Once let it be realised that the question is one of property, and not of religious privilege, and we are satisfied that the judgment of the country will be on the Conservative, and not on the revolutionary, side. It has unfortunately happened up to the present time that this view of the subject has not been pressed upon people's minds. Sentimental appeals have been made to them; piteous pictures have been set before them of the hardships suffered by affectionate Nonconformists, from the intolerance and bigotry of the High Church clergy; once make them see that this is no question of High Church or Low Church, but of the preservation of much that is valued in our Established Church, and we should have no fear of the result. Misrepresentations seldom prevail after they have been thoroughly exposed, and as yet the Liberationist misrepresentations about our churchyards have not been exposed as they ought to be.

But it may be said, 'Your view is a sanguine one; depend upon it that nothing will content the country but the concession of all that the Liberation Society demands.' We doubt the fact, but, be that as it may, we should still say the same. A great party ought to remember that it has a to-morrow as well as a to-day. It ought always to be ready to sacrifice any present passing interest, rather than yield a hair's breadth of the principles to sustain which it exists. For what does the Conservative party exist, if it is not to maintain the present constitutional rights and position of the Church and of the State, and to uphold the just rights of property? We believe that to yield the principle involved in the contest for our churchyards would be to concede the whole principle for which the party professes to contend. It would surrender the principle that the Established Church has rights which must be protected; and it would give up the principle upon which the possession of all property at present rests. It may be impossible to defend these rights, and the existing foundations of property. If so, we must yield to force, and we should not despair under a changed order of things of making the power of the Church felt as much in the future as it has been in the past. But we entertain a real love for our existing constitution in Church and State, under which England has risen to be, we think, the first nation upon earth, and therefore to the uttermost of our ability we will resist, and call upon others to resist, what in our opinion would be a long stride towards the overthrow of what is, and the establishment in its stead of what may now be seen in the great Western Republic.

SHORT NOTICES.

Did the Success of the Evangelical Movement of the Eighteenth Century chiefly consist in the Propagation of Dissent? An Inquiry suggested by an Article in the *Church Quarterly Review* of July, 1877. By the BISHOP OF LLANDAFF. (London: Rivingtons, 1877.)

WE gladly acknowledge the courtesy of the Bishop of Llandaff and his publishers in forwarding to us his Lordship's pamphlet for review; a courtesy which would be ill-retained were we to pass it by with a mere acknowledgment. At the same time it is idle to conceal that we feel a certain awkwardness in reviewing an *Inquiry* which is intended to lead up to an answer traversing certain conclusions of our own, inasmuch as the judicial impartiality proper to a reviewer becomes in such a case peculiarly difficult. We trust, however, that in the remarks we are bound to make, all who are acquainted with the very extensive literature of the subject will see that we are not merely amply fortified with authorities for each detail of what we assert, but that we are not guilty of keeping any material facts out of sight. It is the whole truth, and not only a partial aspect of it, that we seek to present.

And when we come to think over the Bishop's pamphlet we feel that after all he does not contradict the main contention of our article as to the schismatic tendency of the proceedings of the Evangelical leaders. So far from this, we find him making certain grave admissions which concede nearly all we contend for.

The Bishop admits, that supposing our reviewer's facts are true—and he makes no attempt to refute them—'it may well indeed be questioned whether the movement has not been rather the cause of a burden than a blessing' (p. 6).

The Bishop admits, as to the acts attributed to Venn of Huddersfield, and others, that, 'taking them for granted'—and he nowhere disputes their reality—'we may, and ought to, admit' that they did tend to the 'encouragement of schism' (p. 13).

The Bishop admits, that all persons of good sense agree to condemn 'some of the steps taken by some of the Evangelical leaders' (p. 16).

The Bishop admits, that, 'even under the circumstances under which they found themselves, true wisdom would have counselled a patient waiting upon God, rather than the taking a step which might eventually lead to a greater amount of strife and division' (p. 19).

Seeing, then, that his Lordship admits that our reviewer's conclu-

sions are warranted by the facts which constitute his premises, and that he does not rebut those facts, what remains to him? We believe that we describe the Bishop's argument fairly when we say that, having admitted the *acts*, and the *tendency* of the acts, he defends the *actors* on the following grounds:—

I. That *all* the Evangelical leaders are not justly chargeable with the disorderly and schismatical proceedings attributed to the most prominent of them.

II. That there is an *excuse* for those who went furthest astray in the circumstances in which they were placed; that it was to be expected that their zeal should outrun their discretion.

III. That (and here his Lordship betakes himself to an *ad hominem* argument),—that High Churchmen need not talk, for if Evangelicalism propagated Dissent, High Churchmanship has propagated Popery (p. 9); that if Evangelicals have been indiscreet, so have High Churchmen (p. 15); that if allowances have to be made for High Churchmen like Laud, the same should be made for Evangelicals like Venn (p. 13).

IV. That Evangelical teaching helped the country at the time of the French Revolution.

V. As to our reviewer's charge that the societies founded by Evangelicals did not rest on Church principles, his Lordship alleges the support they received from Churchmen, *but he does not rebut the charge*. He admits the mistake made by the Church Missionary Society in reference to Colombo, but says it ought not to be laid to the door of the founders of the society.

And, generally, he refers the growth of Dissent partly to the decline of the Church under the Hanoverian sovereigns, and partly to the increase of population; while he endeavours to obviate the charge of the immorality of Wales under Evangelical teaching by alleging that it was just as bad before.

The fact is that the Bishop is still under the dominion of Sir James Stephen's dictum that 'the first generation of the Evangelical clergy were the second founders of the Anglican Church'—a subject as to which Sir James's connexion with the 'Clapham sect' would scarcely help him to take an impartial view. Accordingly, the Bishop's pamphlet is an industrious attempt to maintain this proposition, and his first step is, almost necessarily, though we think somewhat ungenerously, to charge our reviewer with the suppression of a fact which, *if true*, would indeed be important.

'He should have fairly given his readers to understand,' says the Bishop, 'that there was a body of Evangelical labourers who were independent of the Methodists, and nearly contemporaneous with them, whose labours had an immediate and remarkable influence upon the clergy of England' (p. 4).

The latter portion of this sentence is a quotation from H. Venn's *Life of his grandfather*. Now, this is all very well for the biographer to allege as his *belief*, but when he comes to facts he has to make a statement which is very different,

'the six clergymen whom I have named, together with my grandfather, were all led into similar views within about *ten years after* the time from which Mr. Wesley dates the *final* adoption of his religious sentiments.'

Now, bearing this 'about ten years after' in mind, can any one conceive of Venn, oscillating as he did between Cambridge and London, coming to his view independently of the influence of Whitfield and Wesley, who were then agitating the whole religious mind of England? Besides this, we *know* that his early spiritual adviser was an Oxford Methodist, viz. the Rev. Bryan Broughton. Had it been 'ten years *before*' instead of ten years after, and had we not known of the connexion with Mr. Broughton, the Bishop might have had some case. As it is, we concur with Mr. Philip, whose opinion is supported by Sir James Stephen, the very writer whom the Bishop follows, although upon this crucial point he bears us out entirely, that

'that great body of the Church of England assuming the title of Evangelical may trace back its spiritual genealogy by regular descent from Whitfield. The consanguinity is attested by historical records and the strictest family resemblance. The quarterings of Whitfield are entitled to a conspicuous place in the Evangelical scutcheon, and they who bear it are not wise in being ashamed of their blazonry.'¹

Thus much on the Bishop's preliminary point. A still more important question, but one which the Bishop and Mr. Venn (the biographer) seem alike to shun is—Did these seven men unite with the Methodists and work with them, and so become co-partners in the responsibility of their course?

Surely the Bishop has forgotten that the first name on Mr. Venn's list is Grimshawe, than whom John Wesley had no more devoted adherent, and the last name, Venn's own, equally devoted to Lady Huntingdon. And who that is acquainted with Methodist literature can be ignorant of the names of Romaine, Conyers, Adams, &c.? Surely further argument is superfluous.

On p. 28 this point is incidentally raised again—'Is the reviewer aware,' asks the Bishop, 'that the Rev. Griffith Jones, Rector of Llanddowror, and one of the Fathers of the Evangelical movement, &c., &c.'? We are perfectly familiar with the history and work of Griffith Jones, but who that knows them could have styled him an Evangelical Father in the controversial sense of the word? Let the reader judge. Jones was ordained by Bishop Bull in 1709. He was an indefatigable parish priest. On the Saturdays before Communion Sundays he said the prayers in the church, and after the second lesson catechised (so to say) the intending communicants. The ignorance which he found led him to establish circulating schools throughout Wales, in which he was aided by a liberal donation of Welsh Bibles and other books by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. His efforts met with unexpected success, efforts which

¹ Sir James Stephen's *Essay on the Evangelical Succession*.

never could have succeeded but for the active co-operation and assistance of the Welsh clergy, and Griffith Jones's schools, with their circulating teachers, were to be found throughout the Principality. Jones was an eloquent preacher, very popular with and much sought after by his brethren, and in fine, 'his whole life was spent,' says Johnes, 'in exertions to render the Establishment impregnable against Dissent on the one hand, and the more fearful encroachments of sin, ignorance, and superstition on the other.'¹ Did we seek a contrast to the work of Venn and his six companions, we should choose that of Griffith Jones. What identity of principle there can be between the labours of this true-hearted Anglican priest, ever drawing and attracting men to the Church, and those who built meeting-houses and advised people to use them, we cannot conceive. Grant that in words they extolled the Prayer Book, in act they sent men to the conventicle, where, if it was used at all, it was mutilated first, and whose 'catechising' ended in training up, in one instance at least, thirteen young men who entered the Dissenting ministry. To couple such opposites is monstrous.

But the saddest part is what follows. Towards the close of Jones's life Whitfield, Venn, Berridge, &c., appear upon the scene. One by one, many of these school teachers, and even of the clergy, are perverted, and those who had been the bulwarks of the Church become its assailants. It was not all who were led away. There was one coadjutor of Jones's, who twenty years before Raikes had set up Sunday schools. He, Evans by name, strove to stem the torrent of enthusiasm which was sweeping over Wales, and in his *History of Modern Enthusiasm*, 1752, he opposes all kinds of schism, but especially the fanaticism and religious disorders then introduced. 'He exposes the pious-frauds or tales which fanatical people related, dreams, visions, angels,' &c., &c. Wesley and Whitfield wrote a reply to this book.

Thus much, then, for the Fathers of the Evangelical School. We come now to their work. And here we observe that, as we have above shown, the Bishop does not dispute our facts so much as (in part) our inferences. That their acts tended to schism he admits (while excusing them), but it is the amount of schism they actually produced that he disputes.

'Is it to be supposed,' he asks triumphantly, 'that the vast amount of schism of which he [the reviewer] gives so nice a calculation, could have resulted from the acts to which he refers?' (p. 19).

Why, what else *could* have resulted? The people were told by men who assumed the name of 'the pious,' or the 'Evangelical clergy,' and who were ceaselessly traversing the whole breadth of the country, that all truth and holiness lay with them, and those who thought with them, and that for kindred spirits they must have recourse to the conventicle rather than the church. Why should the Bishop be so surprised that a fourth of the nation should believe them

¹ Philip's *Whitfield*, p. 118.

by the time the century had closed? Fifty years was time enough for the leaven to work, he admits its tendency to schism, and, as the Bishop is certainly not disposed to dispute the zeal with which that leaven was distributed, so neither should he be so startled at what we cannot regard as such a disproportion between effect and cause.

But now as to the excuses which he makes for them. His pleas are three. Firstly, that the whole land was as a valley of dry bones. This, as intended by his Lordship, we do not believe. We know that these men said so. It was necessary for the justification of their course. But are we to accept their statements as simple unexaggerated truth? Surely not. Does the Bishop himself believe that Man was in 'darkness' until Crook, Wesley's itinerant, evangelised it about two years after Hildesley's death?—or that Rowland Hill preached the first Gospel sermon in Devizes? We know what Griffith Jones had done in Wales. Are we to believe the statements of its 'darkness' at the very moment when those efforts had been so widespread? How does the Bishop reconcile Wesley's accounts of Cornwall with Polwhele's description of his congregation and its behaviour, or with Borlase's account of his parish, his attempts to reduce the turbulent to order, and the fact that, notwithstanding the consequent defection of some, he had a congregation of a thousand in the morning and of five hundred in the afternoon, or with the work they did for their people in printing explanatory books for their benefit? How does the Bishop reconcile these *ex parte* statements of universal darkness with the history of Robert Walker and his labours in the North? He had many admirers; why not imitators? Or again, how does it consist with the case of John Bolt, also of this period, or of Parkinson, who notes:

'We had a great many communicants on those three days of sacraments of which Palm Sunday was one. At Easter Day we had about 636, and I administered to about 60 impotent people in the parish?'

It is contrary to all analogy for phenomena like these to be isolated. They may have been exceptional in degree, but certainly not in kind. Alps do not stand straight up out of the plain to their fifteen thousand feet of altitude, but are merely the conspicuous summits of a whole region of mountains. Thus at Newcastle, the head-quarters of Methodism, of the five churches two were open daily, two more had frequent services in the week. At Liverpool, there was daily service at S. Thomas's, and also at S. Werburgh's, Bristol. That much was left undone we doubt not, and so it is still, for all the increased sense of responsibility of recent years. We do not say that all was rose-colour, but we do say that further acquaintance with the details of the period brings out many a notice of godly clergy working well in their forgotten spheres, of devout congregations, and of hundreds of communicants in regions said to have been in 'darkness.' We have to ask what is meant by darkness? From the lips of Grimshawe it would mean the absence of the teaching Wesley had learned from the Moravians, and had imported from Germany. From those of Venn

and Berridge it would mean the absence of the New England Calvinism Whitfield imported from America.

The Bishop's second plea is zeal. His Lordship means it honestly, no doubt. But we as honestly must remark that zeal as well as other things varies in its quality, and that when leading to erroneous action, the *quality* will always be found to have suffered deterioration through admixture with some less praiseworthy affection, blinding the agent to the danger of doing evil that good may come.

His third plea is that the Oxford movement led also to irregularities, and that this condones those of the early Evangelicals.

We deny the parallel, but even if we did not, the argument would be valueless, as being a mere *ad hominem* rejoinder, and a weak one. For first of all, such irregularities were due (as a reaction) to the previous irregularities of the Evangelicals, and were not the outcome of the Oxford movement *per se*; and next our reviewer had carefully disclaimed all sympathy with them. But there is no parallel between the cases. The irregularities of the Oxford men (to use the Bishop's phrase) were those of individuals—the fringe of the garment, not the garment itself. The principle of the movement was to accept the Prayer Book in its integrity, and to win men to the Church, whereas the principle of the Evangelical movement was to follow self-chosen ways. Hence the difference of the resulting phenomena. The *principle* of the Evangelical movement involved a neglect of Church order, and so its results *in bulk* have been what we say. The principle of the Oxford movement was subordination to that order, and therefore, spite of individual eccentricities, its results *in bulk* have been the revival of Churchmanship which we see.

We come now to another point which, with the Bishop, we think material. He admits that for *thirty-seven years* they committed themselves to the full extent we allege. *But*, he argues, after the decision in the Consistorial Court of 1777, their conduct altered. No doubt these clergy could no longer range from parish to parish, defying their diocesans, and preaching in conventicles and unlicensed places. But it is strange that the Bishop fails to see that the law did not change their principles or teaching. The first act of their leaders—and bear in mind that it was a deliberate act, after full consideration—was to sever all houses and congregations over which the Calvinistic party had control from the Anglican communion. Could any act show greater resentment; or after this could they refuse the right hand of fellowship to their Dissenting friends? But the most venerated elders did more than mark their disapproval by this remarkable decision. *They defied the law*. Venn continued to do so until 1790, when inability, not inclination, compelled him to desist. In 1786 he preached for *eight consecutive Sundays* in Surrey Chapel. Scott, Berridge, Pontycross, Maturin, Jones, Charles Romaine, Fletcher, Dr. Haweis, Walker, and others, together with C. Simeon,¹

¹ The mention of Simeon's name reminds us to warn our readers not to be misled by a quotation of the Bishop's from Simeon's life—'In thirty years the Dissenters have not drawn away *three* whom I was not glad to

Venn's pupil, were all guilty of irregularities. 'These men had ceased to be the dupes of bigotry and educational prejudice,' says the author of *Lady Huntingdon's Life*, 'and we are bound to hold up their noble example for imitation.'

But England was not the only field of their labours. 'Poor wicked Scotland,' as the Countess called it, was found to have no Gospel preachers, and pious clergy of all denominations or of none swarm through it, under the patronage of the Evangelical Society. Ireland too is visited. In 1784 Bethesda Chapel, called in Brooks' *Gazetteer*, the Cathedral of the Methodists, originating in a friendly secession from Lady Huntingdon's meeting-house, is built in Dublin. Here 'the Gospel trumpet was sounded from time to time by more than fifty clergy,' some of high position, as *e.g.*, Dr. Law, the Bishop of Elphin. In 1808, by the munificence of their English brethren, a chapel was built in Dublin for the celebration of Divine worship by clergy of all denominations. The Rev. E. H. Harding and Dr. Haweis are named as promoters of this catholic scheme.¹ The chapel passed into the hands of the Independents ere long.

After all this it can excite no surprise that the proceedings of the pious clergy, who were following their leaders' steps, began to excite remonstrance from their less awakened brethren. Thus Richardson, in 1808, writes from York :—

'The irregularities of these men have brought many serious inconveniences on us who proceed in an orderly way, by alienating from us the hearts of some of our flock, who are dazzled with the appearance of superior zeal and courage in such characters. Among the *vast numbers* that are earnest and sincere preachers of the Gospel, there are not many who would be listened to by a correct ear without a mixture of disgust. The evil of schism and its mischievous tendencies are so little perceived and guarded against by the serious clergy, that on the ground of discipline and order our title to the character of true Churchmen cannot be vindicated.' (*Wilberforce's Correspondence*, vol. i. p. 237.)

Has our reviewer spoken more strongly than Richardson? The law might restrain some—not all—of the pious clergy from officiating in conventicles, but it could not prevent their associating with schismatics in their schemes and supporting their institutions; and Butt might still ask alms at the meeting-house door for the support

get rid of,' as though three was the extent of his losses. Now, not to speak of his general congregation, of whom he says but little, let us take his *class* of 120 spiritually enlightened, who continued in rebellion about eighteen months, at the end of which he began to dismiss those who had been misled, *sparing the leaders*, lest he should lose all, and no mention being made of the number dismissed, while at last he is compelled to deal with the class-leaders too: preachers' licenses had been taken out, and the like. Incidentally we learn that three leaders left him, drawing away many of the spiritually enlightened; how many leaders in all is left to conjecture. The story is very confused, and Simeon is very reticent on the subject. (*Simeon's Memoirs*, pp. 101, 109, 242, 298.)

¹ Harding and Hulton took part in the dedication services.

of schism, which, as he died in middle age in 1795, he probably did to the last. But slight as was its effect on the clergy, it could not touch the laity, who learned to have no scruple in attending Dissenting services. So late as 1817, Dr. Gaskin remonstrates with Wilberforce (*Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 366) for joining with them in their Lord's Supper; and from the fact that Wilberforce docketed the letter 'Church claims,' it deserves consideration. Now, if even Wilberforce needed remonstrance in 1817, when after Richardson's letter of 1808 some had been led to reflect on the evils of schism, what must it have been in 1800, when the laity could point to their most respected leaders, some still living, others but lately deceased, who drew no distinction between Church and meeting? Venn, it is true, in 1792, in writing to his son, doubts his earlier course, but he was now withdrawn from work and from influence. In 1803 Scott declines further irregular preaching; but as he gives his reasons, we learn that, like Fletcher and most others, he had no conception of the Church as a corporate body. He condemns the practice of holding a living and yet preaching irregularly; he would allow some license to those who held only curacies or lectureships; but clergy without cure he would allow to preach where and as they chose. The sum is—they regarded the English Church as one among many sects, of which the aggregate might compose the visible Church, so far as any visible Church existed. Thus, though declining to preach in a conventicle, Scott did not refuse, in compliance with the decision of Simeon and the Evangelicals, to preach the annual sermon of the London Missionary Society, a custom long continued by the pious clergy—a practice impossible if they had understood that it was wrong to foster institutions which tended to destroy Church unity.

We come now to the societies instituted about this time, and first the Church Missionary Society. We cannot accept the Bishop's account of its origin. That letters from Calcutta called attention to India¹ (1788) may be true. In 1795, a legacy of 4,000*l.* being at the disposal of the pious clergy, Indian Missions were considered at Ranceby,² in Lincolnshire. In 1796 it was debated at the Eclectic³ in London. In 1799 the Society for Missions to Africa and the East⁴ was formally established. Scott's son ascribes the foundation of this Society 'to my father, in common with several dear friends, Rev. Messrs. Newton, Foster, Cecil, Venn, Goode, and Mr. Thornton.' We add the names of C. Simeon, J. Pratt, Mr. C. Grant, and Mr. Wilberforce. Scott was secretary, and preached the first annual sermon.⁵ A proposal to memorialise the bishops and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge on the subject of missions was rejected by the Eclectic, showing the animus of the meeting. Whether the rules of the Church Missionary Society are what they should be, and it is their administrators who are in fault, or whether the rules are vicious in themselves, so as to absolve those who carry them out, we leave the Bishop to decide. This much is clear, the Society has

¹ Simeon's *Life*, p. 61.

² *Ibid.*, p. 86.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 88.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 126.

⁵ Scott's *Life*, pp. 311-312.

always been at issue with bishops, whether those bishops were of its own school or not; while as to the epithet 'Church,' on which the Bishop lays such stress, surely it does not do the Society much credit to assume the name while repudiating the discipline. But writes the Bishop (p. 20) :—

'How dare the reviewer say that all support had been withdrawn from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel? Does he venture to affirm of his own knowledge that none of them contributed to this sum of 7,000*l.*?'

We reply that our reviewer is correct. We have examined the list of subscribers to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and to the best of our belief, if we except Mr. Gisborne, not one name of men calling themselves Evangelical is there, while among the first subscribers to the Religious Tract Society stand the names of J. Newton, J. Pratt, John Eyre, W. Winckworth, C. Simeon, Adm. Gambier, Sir R. Hill, W. Wilberforce, and Z. Macaulay. As to the Bible Society, 'it is well known,' says the Bishop, 'that its institution was simply owing to the fact that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge had been unable to supply the wants of Wales.' Surely his Lordship has been imposed upon. Why in 1827 the Bible Society had not a Welsh edition of the Bible, whereas in 1743 the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge distributed 15,000 in the Principality, which being insufficient, it put to press another edition of the same number, 5,000 copies of the New Testament, and 5,000 Prayer Books. When these were exhausted, a third edition of the Old and New Testament was undertaken at the request of the Welsh, and 20,000 were printed in a larger type. In 1799 an edition of 10,000 of the Old and New Testament and 2,000 of the New Testament was printed at the University Press, besides an edition of the Common Prayer. This edition was carefully revised by the Rev. Evan Evans and the Rev. J. Roberts, and this is the Society which had to be superseded by one which had not a Welsh Bible in 1827! Possibly the Bishop will rejoin that the Bible Society *did* put forth a Welsh Bible in 1806. We are perfectly aware of it. But whereas the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge secured Welsh scholars for its Bible, the Bible Society selected an ex-clergyman, an itinerant among the Calvinistic Methodists, to make a new translation, which turned out so full of errors that the Welsh bishops interfered to suppress it. The Committee of the Bible Society also engaged a Wesleyan Methodist of doubtful antecedents to prepare an Irish Bible, which so teemed with blunders that the Irish Society interfered to have it too withdrawn. Further into this subject we have no space to go, though similar facts might be adduced in abundance—facts, not opinions—and which lead us to feel it of small importance that a good opinion of this and similar societies was entertained by various worthy men such as the Bishop quotes.

We pass on to the question of the moral improvement of the people. The Bishop quotes Butler, Secker, and Conybeare as to its corrupt condition in 1750. Our reviewer alleged the same, and

accounted for it—1st, by the suppression of Convocation, which wanted to deal with the Arians and their debasing creed; 2nd, by Walpole's suppression of Church activity, and promotion of persons indifferent to the Church's welfare, issuing in the cessation of church building, &c., and by his suppression of the Church Societies for the improvement of morals; 3rd, by the influence of a profligate Court. So far we are agreed. Our reviewer went on to show that the labours of the Evangelicals did not improve this state of things, and among other evidences adduced the census paper as to Wales. Now, if the Bishop can correct our figures, well and good. But if he can *not*, what avails it to him to say that things were as bad in 1750 as in 1800? It is only repeating our statement that they had not been mended by the Evangelicals. We believe that there was even a falling off. Richardson says so; Dr. Johnson¹ says so; Bishop Porteus² says so, citing the astounding fact that there had been 198 applications for divorce in the (then) forty years of George III.'s reign. That, as our reviewer showed, Antinomianism largely resulted from the Calvinistic teaching is allowed. Fletcher does not disguise the evil among Wesley's followers; and Scott, in 1799, writes³ that 'a tendency to Antinomianism is the bane of Evangelical preaching in this day.' Newton admits this result of Romaine's teaching, and Scott records the fruits of Newton's work at Olney. The only wonder is that these good men, for such they were, never seem to have suspected that results so alien to their wishes, and so contrary to their example, must have been due to some flaw inherent in their teaching.

And here we should have paused, but for the indignant astonishment of the Bishop at the charge, 'that to act in the spirit of the Prayer Book was to condemn their teaching and their practice.' We have already touched on the subjective character of their teaching, and their ignoring the corporate character of the Church, which latter alone is enough to dissociate them from the spirit of the Prayer Book. But lest the Bishop should fancy us overstraining our point, we *must* add an example or two. Mr. Dallas, in claiming liberty for Church Missionary Society's agents, writes; 'The Church is a congregation of faithful men. It is *not*, as some have supposed, a corporate body.' The Rev. C. Yorke: 'This principle' (*i.e.* the oneness of the Church) 'cannot come from Scripture, because in Scripture it cannot be found.' Neither can the Bishop have himself forgotten the action (which even Bishop D. Wilson, of Calcutta, condemned) of the Islington clergy against the Bishop of London's 1842 charge, or the manifesto of Chancellor Raikes, sent, we believe, to every parish in England, exhorting wardens and others to resist the restoration of rubrical observances,—or the objections to the revival of daily service, which one writer called 'the broad hems and phylacteries of matins and evensong,' another (Mr. C. Yorke) saying that all that was meant by daily service was an injunction not to go to the Romanist matins; and another, that it was enjoined at the Reformation 'to teach people to read'! And does the Bishop for-

¹ *Rambler*, No. 97.² *Porteus' Life*, p. 149.³ *Scott's Life*, p. 348.

get the storm of objections to the doctrine of baptism, or the riotous proceedings stirred up in the diocese of Exeter wherever men acted in obedience to the rubric and the requirements of the bishop?

Space compels us to suppress many an illustrative quotation, but we must not conclude without reminding our readers that if we refuse to detach the Evangelicals from the Methodists, we have not done it without good reasons, and that the authority of Philip and Sir J. Stephen, who had carefully weighed the evidence, is with us. We have accumulated proof on proof that the Methodists and Evangelicals were virtually one, for 37 years working on the same principles, actuated by the same spirit, promulgating the same doctrines, and jointly responsible for the results. We have pointed out that their action in the crisis of 1777, when originated the great schism of the Calvinistic Methodists, compelled them to support their Nonconforming brethren, whom they could not, in honour, abandon, and that during the last quarter of the century no change occurred in their teaching, and little in their practice, save a certain amount of abstention from preaching in conventicles. We have shown that this fraternising with schismatics could do no violence to their consciences, inasmuch as Church unity formed no part of their creed, that they made no efforts to draw people to the Church as *the* Church, but only to a certain section in it; and Berridge frankly tells us the result, when, after rebuking Lady Huntingdon 'for growing sadly churchified,' he writes, 'God sends Gospel ministers into the Church to call people out of it. What has happened to Mr. Venn's Yorkshire flock, and will happen to his Yelling flock, and mine,'—also Dr. Conyers' flock at Helmsley. To ask us to believe that men so acting and so animated were the second founders of the Anglican Church, based as she is on Catholic truth and Apostolic order, is as reasonable as to ask us to believe that they could lay the foundations of a castle in the air. We have shown, too, that their disparagement of objective worship was felt to be an obstacle in the way of those who were seeking to train their flocks in godly living and Church order; for Venn (*Life*, 3rd edition, p. 15) grants that there were many such, and that instances are not few, as in Wales, where their fanaticism overshadowed and extinguished Church life. We have shown that the second generation trod in the steps of the first, accepting their doctrines and principles, though rendering a partial obedience to the law, while even as to the third generation our references to the controversies and pamphlets of forty years ago prove that the heaven had not died out.

No doubt the Arian School did great mischief, but, as it acted more by way of deadening men's consciences, it did not so much promote, as prepare for, active dissent. Bennett and Bogue, impartial witnesses, attest this. Reviewing carefully all the facts, the testimony of Berridge, the experience of Philip, 'that the progress of Dissent and Methodism keeps pace with the progress of Evangelical sentiments in the Church,'¹ and remembering also the weighty

¹ Philip's *Whitfield*, p. 53; Bennett and Bogue, vol. iv. p. 316.

and important admissions of the Bishop himself, we feel the evidence to be absolutely overwhelming in favour of our reviewer's conclusion that the vast increase of Dissent, and the multiplication of sects, was the legitimate outcome of the mistaken course taken by the Fathers of the Evangelical movement.

Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata edidit Joannes Baptista Pitra T.T. S. Callisti, Bibliothecarius S.R.E. Tom. I. (Parisiis : A. Jouby et Roger, Bibliopolis, Via vulgo dicta Des Grands Augustins, No. 7. 1876.)

As a Benedictine monk in the abbey of Solesmes, under the headship of Gueranger, Dom Pitra published the four well-known volumes of his *Spicilegium Solesmense* at intervals between 1852 and 1858. Scholarship, and especially Greek scholarship, is by no means a common attainment among Roman Catholic ecclesiastics of our day, and the merits of the French Benedictine were speedily appreciated and rewarded by the highest authorities of his Church. Dom Pitra was made a Cardinal and also Librarian of the Holy See, and was entrusted by Pius IX. with the task of digesting the history and investigating the literary monuments of the Canon Law of the Greek Churches. The results of these inquiries are to be found in two volumes published at Rome in 1864 and 1868. We are told in the preface to the volume now before us that other literary work in connexion with the Vatican Council devolved upon the new Cardinal, and it is only recently that he has found leisure and opportunity to revert to his old patristic studies. In the present volume of *Analecta* we have the first instalment of a new series of hitherto unedited ecclesiastical writings, and we are sure that it will be valued by all competent critics. It is remarkable that Cardinal Pitra, in his Prolegomena, complains that his co-religionists as a body have shown but little sympathy with his labours. He has found more readers and sympathisers in England, in Holland, and in Germany than among the French or Italian priesthood. Indeed, he deprecates rather pathetically the cold reception which he fears that his present work in particular will experience among his brethren of the Latin Communion. For, as it happens, this volume of *Analecta* is devoted exclusively to the religious poetry of the Greek melodists who wrote between the sixth and ninth centuries. The learned editor is under the apprehension that some will find nothing in his collection 'præter populares et aniles priscae ecclesiæ cantilenas.' But the truth is that we have here a newly opened mine of literary treasures of the highest interest and value. If we were inclined to be hypercritical we should question the fact that the contents of this volume had been prepared—as the title declares—for the *Spicilegium* of Solesmes. For it was on a visit to Russia, in search for materials for his work on Greek Canon Law, that Cardinal Pitra accidentally discovered at Moscow a manuscript 'βιβλίδιον, barbarè inscriptum Κονταρίν,' which revealed to him the hitherto unsuspected existence of a large body of Greek religious poetry that had almost perished from human knowledge. Further researches

VOL. V.—NO. X.

N N

brought to light a similar manuscript at Turin and another in the Corsini library at Rome. These two, together with the fragmentary Moscow Codex, furnished the substance and recovered the title of the long-lost *Τροπολόγιον*. The *Κοντακάριον* of the Moscow MS. seems, by the way, to have been meant for *Κοντάκιον*. The *Tropologium*, in short, is the great collection of sacred poetry from which the *troparia* and *kontakia* of the Greek Office-books were taken.

Having made these discoveries and tested them, Cardinal Pitra devoted himself to the thorough investigation of the subject. He was at first greatly perplexed by the rhythmic and structural difficulties of these poems. But after patient inquiry he unravelled the metres and the artificial subtleties of the style. His learned preface is an exhaustive essay on the poetry of the Melodists of the Greek communion. He first discusses the *Tropologium* itself, and then the poets whose works it contains. These are the older Melodists, including S. Romanus, and S. Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople; and those of the later school, divided into the poets of S. Saba, in Palestine, and those of the Studium (a famous monastery in Constantinople), and certain Italo-Greek writers of Sicilian or Calabrian monasteries. Next follows a dissertation on the metres and technical divisions of these sacred odes. And then the text gives, in beautiful typography, the whole works of S. Romanus—twenty-nine odes in all, followed by the compositions of twenty-three other melodists, and lastly eighty-three canticles by unknown writers. All these are illustrated by a Latin translation, biographical and historical disquisitions, and copious critical notes; and a series of careful indices completes this laborious and scholar-like work.

Of the writers whose works are thus collected some are quite new to literary history, while of others very little has been hitherto known. The most eminent of the earlier school, dating from the fifth and sixth centuries, are S. Romanus, S. Auxentius, Sergius, Georgius, Cuculus, and Anastasius. The later Melodists belonged to the times of the Iconoclastic troubles. The most remarkable of the Sabaite poets are Cosmas, John of Damascus, Theophanes, and Theodorus. Those of the Studium include S. Theodore—eighteen of whose odes are here published—his brother Joseph, Archbishop of Thessalonica, and Simeon Metaphrastes. The poems themselves are of varying degrees of merit. All are strangely prolix—the besetting sin of all Greek religious compositions. Many are full of wearisome and trifling conceits. But others are of touching simplicity and beauty. The earlier poems are highly dramatic, and Cardinal Pitra hazards the very plausible opinion that we may see in them the first beginnings of the mysteries or miracle-plays of Western Christendom. They are for the most part expansions, often in the form of dialogues, of Scriptural histories: for example, of the Nativity, the Last Judgment, the Passion, the Epiphany, and the like. Sometimes the subjects are taken from the Old Testament; such as the story of Joseph, the Three Children in the Furnace, Elijah, or Daniel. Some later writers, as S. Theodore of the Studium, confine themselves to Christian hagiology. Altogether Cardinal

Pitra has opened a very rich store to theologians and hymnologists. We cannot conclude our brief notice of this interesting volume without expressing our regret that our own great liturgist and hymnologist, John Mason Neale, who by his beautiful translations has made many Greek hymns familiar to Christian congregations, did not live to welcome a work by a kindred spirit which would have filled him with joy. Cardinal Pitra, who does not read English, we believe, seems never to have heard of Neale's *Introduction to the History of the Holy Eastern Church*. In that work—a book of prodigious learning—many of the questions as to Greek hymnology, which are discussed in the *Prolegomena* before us, were elucidated with even more acumen and more poetical sympathy than Cardinal Pitra has brought to bear on the subject. Nor can we help comparing the lots of these two great contemporary scholars. Neale was allowed to die in comparative obscurity, the master of a small almshouse in lay patronage. But Pitra, not more highly gifted than his English rival, was taken from his monastery and placed in comparatively early life in a position of dignity and competency, which has enabled him to pursue his studies under most advantageous circumstances, to the signal honour of the communion to which he belongs and to the common benefit of the Church at large.

Remains, Literary and Theological, of Connop Thirlwall, Lord Bishop of S. David's. Edited by J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, D.D., Canon of Llandaff; Hulseian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge; and Honorary Chaplain to the Queen. Vol. III. (London: Daldy, Isbister, and Co., 1878.)

THIS volume forms part of the memorial now being published under various editors to the late Bishop Thirlwall. A portly octavo volume is made up partly of articles on critical and philological subjects, most of which appeared originally in the *Philological Museum*, a journal originated by the Bishop and his friend, Julius Charles Hare; of a selection from the pamphlets, of which the Bishop poured forth for so many years a succession, upon events of public interest; and of sermons, most of which have likewise been printed before. The former class of essays deals with subjects unintelligible or uninteresting to the majority of readers, and can never, we imagine, have found any large circulation. It was quite right to republish them here, for they bear witness to a very marked characteristic of the writer—that keen *sympathy* with the Greek writers which, no less than his wide acquaintance with their works, tended to make him the man he was. The essay on the 'Irony of Sophocles' seems to us a masterpiece of philosophical criticism; the monograph on 'Memnon' will remind many readers of passages in Mr. W. E. Gladstone's recent work on 'Homeric Synchronisms:' but they will, it appears to us on the whole, attract but a languid interest, and be passed over by many readers. Such impressions as the reader derives from them do undoubtedly excite a real respect for the scholarship and the learning which are so apparent, and still more for the mental power and grasp which enable him to wield it 'as lightly as a flower.'

It will be otherwise with the pamphlets. In a sense, indeed, they inspire respect for the intellectual force and vigour and power of repartee which the writer uses with so much effect. But no one coming newly upon them would suspect the writer to be a Bishop. In matters of theology he is hard, captious, incredulous; in matters of merely ecclesiastical concern, a modern Gallio, and cares for none of those things. His bias was clearly to take objections. Put him in front of a dogmatic statement, and his impulse was to pick holes in it if he could. But enough of this for the present.

We find here the Bishop's famous speeches on the Disabilities of the Jews, on the Irish Church, and on the Athanasian Creed, all delivered in the House of Lords. Quite as characteristic are the only two 'Letters' selected for publication out of all the Bishop wrote—viz., 'On Diocesan Synods,' and on the 'Episcopal Meeting of 1867,' *videlicet* the Pan-Anglican Synod. Of course he disliked both, and opposed them with all his keen sarcasm and lawyer-like cleverness; of course, too, the Church carried out both in spite of him; and he was left of late years to reiterate Cassandra-like appeals to a world which heard and disregarded, and whose heart, indeed, as distinguished from its intellect, he had never cared to address.

There are eight sermons here, one and all Bishop Thirlwall all over.

The Folkestone Ritual Case. The Argument delivered before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council (January 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, and February 1, 1877), in the case of *Ridsdale v. Clifton* and others, by Sir JAMES STEPHEN, Q.C., and Mr. A. CHARLES, Q.C. (on behalf of the Appellant), and by A. J. STEPHENS, LL.D., Q.C., and Mr. B. SHAW (on behalf of the Respondents). Together with the Proceedings in the Case, the Judgment of Lord Penzance, and the Report of the Judicial Committee. (London: C. Kegan Paul and Co., Paternoster Square, 1878.)

IN this complete and elaborate volume Mr. T. W. Perry has given us no mere newspaper account of these important arguments and proceedings, but a genuinely authoritative report of everything. As to the arguments of counsel, a *verbatim* report was first taken by shorthand writers, Messrs. Marten and Meredith, 13 New Inn, and then their report was revised and corrected by the several counsel themselves, excepting only that Mr. B. Shaw not having completed his revision at the time of his decease, such revision was completed by Mr. H. R. Droop.

The report of the Judicial Committee to Her Majesty is of course a public document; and, that nothing may be wanting, Mr. Perry has prefixed all the documents which connect the Appeal with the original Suit in the Court of Lord Penzance.

The volume is indispensable to any one who wishes either to understand the case itself, or to make his library complete with respect to our Church history of 1877. But though this is much, we are bound to add that the volume has even a higher value to any one who desires to understand the strange multiplicity of crossing ques-

tions and points of history which had to be investigated in the course of this important suit. Its use in this respect is made easy by a series of indices, not merely full and copious, but admirably arranged, and extending over *eight-and-twenty* pages, by reference to which the reader can refer at once to all that was advanced *pro* or *con.* upon almost any point on which he seeks for information. Thus, for example—we are selecting almost at random—turning to the word ‘Injunctions,’ you have a complete list of all the points in their history and character which were brought out in the arguments; under the words ‘Table’ and ‘Before,’ all that concerns the place and variations of place of the Altar, and so on generally. But to point out all the uses of this publication we should have to write not a notice but a pamphlet.

While naming this volume to our readers we ought to add that they should place upon their shelves along with it the compiler’s *Notes on the Judgment (1871) of the Judicial Committee on the Purchas Case*¹ (Masters, 1877), which the Ridsdale Judgment had in so many points to reconsider. The one is not complete without the other. With the two he will be fully armed on the matter in hand.

Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church. By E. DE PRESSENSÉ, D.D. Translated by Annie Harwood-Holmden. (London: Hodder and Stoughton.)

THIS volume reminds us of a form of composition not unfrequent in the last generation, and which was entitled ‘Christian Antiquities.’ It is a museum of antiquarian details respecting the Christianity of the second and third centuries A.D., not given wholly in their rawness indeed, but as certainly not organised in the full degree of which they are capable. In truth, M. De Pressensé does not sympathise fully with the Churches of the period of which he writes, because he considers it to have been a period of declension and unfaithfulness to the standards of faith and discipline set up not very long before by the Apostles. But a few sentences from his ‘Preface’ will show his standpoint more indisputably than any words of our own:—

‘While every other form of religion, finding itself incapable of controlling and transfusing the entire life, had remained a thing apart, entrenched behind the barrier which divided the sacred from the profane, primitive Christianity made every man a priest, every home a sanctuary, and consecrated every day and every act of common life to the service of God. It was, therefore, directly opposed to the idea of a priestly class, or even of a sanctuary in the Jewish sense of the word, and repudiated the notion of an ascetic saintliness incompatible with family life. We shall show that all its primitive institutions are animated by this spirit; and shall show further how rapid and certain was its decline so soon as it lost sight of this great principle, whether in its ecclesiastical, social, or moral life. We shall have to trace the fatal steps by which, having once abandoned this sublime spirituality, it was led to restore the obsolete distinctions between sacred and profane, to set up a new priesthood, a

¹ Published by Masters, New Bond Street, 1877.

new ritualism, more or less Judaic, and a new ascetic standard of perfection. It is very important to note the gradual transitions out of which arose that powerful hierarchical system which became triumphant in the fourth century' (p. xxii.).

Without sympathy it is impossible to enter fully into the spirit of a period. At the same time, we believe the author has continually endeavoured to be fair; we have found no serious inaccuracy; and there is here a large mass of information, gathered with surprising accuracy from the extant records. It is, perhaps, unfortunate for the value of the treatise that the author should have been face to face in France with so complete a caricature of primitive Christianity as the dominant Ultramontanist: for repulsion from it is plainly to be traced in what he says concerning e.g. Episcopacy, or the sacramental principle. And it is manifest that if what he considers to have been the character of the primitive Church were to be taken as strictly and literally accurate, the majority of the Churches existent at the present time could not be said in any sense to be its representatives, since they would differ from it in almost every particular; which we take to be a *reductio ad absurdum* of his contention. He says, in fact, 'I have not endeavoured to find the Church to which I myself am attached in that great past.'

Growth of the Spirit of Christianity, from the First Century to the Dawn of the Lutheran Era. By the Rev. GEORGE MATHESON, M.A., B.D. Two Volumes. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1877.)

THE value of such a work as this to Churchmen depends entirely upon who it is that has written it. It is not, that is to say, in any sense a work of research, and therefore adds nothing to our *knowledge* of the facts treated. It is simply a re-grouping of the facts of religious history in an arbitrary order of the writer's own. And, therefore, all depends upon what that writer is, and what is his conception of the spirit of Christianity, the growth and development of which he thus essays to trace.

Now the author before us is a Protestant of the Protestants; and he identifies Christianity with the Protestant, *individualising* spirit, which makes religion consist in the relations of individual souls to God; and this not merely to begin with, and as a *foundation* of relation, in which sense it is true, but from the beginning to the end of the present life in all its incidents. He does not, indeed, anywhere that we have noticed, formulate this fundamental theory, nor does he carry it uniformly out to its natural completeness. Very few Protestants do that, happily for themselves; and probably the only logical anti-Catholics are the Quakers and Plymouth Brethren, in their entire rejection of any earthly instrumentalities. For it is rigidly true, that if the only object of the Christian religion be to modify and transform in silence and secrecy the feelings of the human heart, the institution of the Catholic Church was at best a superfluity, and a dangerous one. And, in fact, the present writer

traces over and over again the retardation of the growth of the Christian sentiment, in which, according to him, resides the 'Spirit of Christianity,' to the growth into power and acceptance of the visible Church of the time. His formula is that a strong Church will always coexist with a weak Christianity—or conversely, a weak Church with a strong Christianity. So that according to him the Church idea is not merely not identical with Christianity, it is positively antagonistic to it all through history; which we take to be, from our point of view, a *reductio ad absurdum*.

Having premised so much as to the fundamental conception, we may say that the working out of it merits all praise. The author's habits of thought and tone of composition form a pleasing contrast to some controversialists we could name upon his side. Courteous, tolerant, and scholarly, he never says a harsh word, even of those persons whose tendencies of thought and practice he most disapproves. It is a real pleasure to peruse the brilliant pages in which the author presents his idea of men and of the great movements of religious thought; and we feel sure that every reader will be charmed with the writer's evident perspicuity and philosophical insight. He always means to be just; sometimes, indeed, his anxiety to be free and unprejudiced leads him into the opposite extreme of thought; as e.g. where he would fain make out that Mohammedanism was a highly civilising influence, and contrasted favourably with Christianity; or, again, in regarding the mountain glens of the Valais as an Arcadia of pious thought and pure lives, and ignoring the real Manicheism and questionable morals with which the inhabitants of those Piedmontese glens were deeply tainted.

In short, these volumes are the work of a very able and pious and cultured thinker; though we cannot for ourselves accept a theory which considers that the Apostles and their contemporaries were in a state of spiritual imperfection and nonage, and that the full development of the 'Spirit of Christianity' was reserved for Luther and his age. But those who can, will find in these volumes the most luminous and attractive exposition of their individualist view that has appeared for a very long time.

Paulinism: a Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology. By OTTO PFLEIDERER, Doctor and Professor of Theology at Jena. Vol. II. The History of Paulinism in the Primitive Church. (London: Williams and Norgate.)

The second volume is far more calm and business-like, if it is not less arbitrary, than the first. The author does not invert so entirely the traditional views of the various later events of the Apostle's mission, as he has chosen to do with the *earlier*. Thus his appreciation of the 'contest about the Law' (chap. viii.) seems to us calm and accurate; though he has exaggerated the extent of the division between the great parties—Judaizing and Pauline—in the Primitive Church, and we think him certainly mistaken in laying down that the compromise was *without a principle and illogical*. It seems to us, on the contrary, perfectly logical to say that Jews might continue

in the practice of the Mosaic Law without ceasing to be Christians, and yet that heathens might become Christians without passing through the preparatory grade of Judaism. There was nothing in Christianity so far different from Judaism that, as the present author lays down, 'the converted Jew, in order to be a Christian, must cease to be a Jew' (p. 11). On the contrary, Christianity constantly claimed from the first to be the completion and perfection of the Law. He has evidently transferred into the Pauline age the condition of his own time, to which what he says no doubt applies; but why? because whilst Christianity has gone somewhat forward from the stand-point of that age, *Judaism has gone back* from it; and thus the present rift between the two has come into existence. Some of his remarks on the Epistle to the Hebrews are worth serious consideration.

Bible Studies. By M. M. KALISCH, Ph.D., M.A. Part I. 'The Prophecies of Balaam' (Numbers xxii. to xxiv.), or, 'The Hebrew and the Heathen.' (London: Longmans, Green, and Co.)

THIS volume, we are told, is the fruit of a period of 'severe and lingering illness,' during the latter part of which the author, though not strong enough to resume in their full extent his usual avocations, was yet able to examine some of those minor 'problems of Biblical criticism and religious history which are still awaiting a final solution.'

In the solution which Dr. Kalisch has given to the 'problems' which surround the history of Balaam, he has given his imagination full play. He makes the most of the difficulties which are in the way of every hypothesis of the mode in which the history with its accompanying prophecies originated at first, and then became known to the nation of Israel. Regarding each and all of these as entirely insoluble, he concludes that the story is altogether fictitious, and 'that the Book of Balaam is the production of some gifted Hebrew, who, availing himself of popular traditions, employed them as a basis for conveying his views regarding Israel's greatness and mission by means of prophecies skilfully interwoven with history transmitted from earlier ages.' And when once composed it was, he thinks, 'preserved as a small book or scroll from generation to generation, till it was ultimately embodied in the great national work, the Pentateuch, as one of its most precious ornaments.' He distinguishes between the work itself as he finds it embodied in the Book of Numbers, and the independent and, as he regards them, discordant traditions respecting Balaam found in Numbers xxxi., 8, xxv. comp. Rev. ii. 14. But it is not even then manageable; so that he further discards, as later additions, the entire miraculous episode in xxii. 22-25, and the magnificent conclusion of the final prophecy, xxiv. 18-24. It is manifest how utterly arbitrary much of this is. The very existence of varying traditions, which he himself allows, should have occasioned more caution in theorising. It may be that the history of Balaam was written independently and incorporated in the Book of Numbers; but beyond that, we seem not to be in a position to speak at all positively of its history. The writer draws an interesting parallel between the story of Balaam and the Book of Ruth; it is

remarkable that the subject-matter of each of these independent narratives should have a connexion with the Moabites; but why should our author conclude that they were *both* written during the reign of David? There is much in this excursus which the Biblical scholar will know how to use, and which is calculated to increase his knowledge and thorough appreciation of this remarkable composition; but it is strongly marked by rashness and arbitrariness. It is, perhaps, not surprising that a writer who sets down the prophecies themselves as mere human forgeries should regard the episode of the ass as fabulous.

Masters in English Theology: Being the King's College Lectures for 1877. Edited, with an Historical Preface, by ALFRED BARRY, D.D., Principal. (London: John Murray.)

THE growing custom of setting on foot courses of lectures on specific subjects connected with Church history, and of publishing the lectures after delivery, seems a popular one. There must have been as many as six or seven of these courses last year in London alone; and we have before us the lectures composing one of these. Readers will find here the characters and careers of the great 'masters of theology' since the Reformation, handled with due respect, and yet with a freedom and breadth befitting at once the lecturer and the character of the institution where the addresses were delivered. Where one and all are admirable, there is little room for special encomium, or for distinguishing between the separate writers. We may, however, remark that the Dean of St. Paul's had a congenial subject to deal with in Bishop Andrewes, and has ably improved his opportunity; while Dr. Plumptre has been singularly felicitous in his summing up and estimate of the value of a work much set by at one time, and not obsolete even now—Chillingworth's *Religion of Protestants*. Probably Canon Westcott's lectures on Benjamin Whichcote will have more of novelty than any other, and introduce the reading public to a man altogether unknown to many, even well-informed persons—the precursor and father of the not unimportant school of Cambridge Platonists.

Dr. Barry introduces the volume with a somewhat solid but substantially useful *catalogue raisonné* of the lectures. It is necessarily a mere tentative framework, for it would require a volume to fit these six men properly into their places.

Here is one of Dr. Farrar's audacious generalisations, in which he endeavours to sum up at once his own subject and those of his *collaborateurs*:—

'It is quite true that Jeremy Taylor has not the rude force of Latimer, the immense erudition of Ussher, the balanced stateliness and perfect equilibrium of Hooker, the flashing wit of South, the occasional intensity of Donne, the careful accuracy of Pearson, the compressed forcefulness of Barrow, the metaphysical profundity of Butler, the tender unction of Wilson, the polished equanimity of Tillotson, and, after these, but few others are at all worth mentioning; but, as in unfeigned piety and blameless purity of life he stands their equal, so in the combination of genius with eloquence he towers above the greatest of them all. In the fine expression of Bishop Warburton, he darts into all their excellences a ray

of lightning. And again, if he has not the characteristic defects, he has none of Latimer's indecorum, or of South's vulgarity, or Donne's tediousness, or Butler's aridity, or Tillotson's coldness, or Wilson's common-place' (p. 190).

Servetus and Calvin: a Study of an important Epoch in the Early History of the Reformation. By R. WILLIS, M.D. (London: Henry S. King and Co., 1877.)

THE sub-title of this volume is a mistake. The work is certainly *not* 'a study of an epoch' in any sense whatever. It seems discourteous to accuse the author of using words in an incorrect sense; but it strikes us that he meant, not 'epoch' but 'episode.' The life and fate of the wrong-headed but unfortunate Servetus is an *episode* in the history of the great upheaval of the sixteenth century, and a very discreditable one it is to the Reformation and its adherents. We do not refer merely to the outrageous illegality of the entire trial and sentence, which the present author makes clear enough; but to the perfidy shown by Calvin in order to wreak his hatred on the (no doubt very provoking) adversary who declined to acknowledge the superiority of him, Messire Jehan Cauvin, by the hands of the ecclesiastical authorities at Vienne. And the trial at Geneva was not only a crime, it was a blunder. The flighty and inconsistent thinker, such as Servetus was, however intelligent, is comparatively innoxious when left alone; for his contemporaries take his measure instinctively. But turn him into a martyr, and you make his folly respectable. And that was just what Calvin did. He could have done his adversary no better than to throw into shade his faults and errors—which were neither few nor small—by comparison with his terrible death, and to surround his memory with the halo of martyrdom. His hatred and malignity over-reached itself, as is not uncommonly seen. Whilst, therefore, we are in substantial agreement with the present author in the main purpose of his work, we are bound to say that our agreement with him ends there. The spirit and tone in which it is written are by no means commendable. The author's sympathy with his hero not merely *extends* to all his strange aberrations from the Faith, but is evidently called forth specifically by them. It is very natural that Dr. Willis, as a physician, should be enthusiastic about a man who discovered the pulmonary circulation of the blood something like a century before our own illustrious countryman, Harvey, as is apparently shown in his otherwise objectionable treatise, 'Christianismi Restitutio.' But it is not at all natural nor laudable that his biographer should gloat over the wild and reprehensible theological speculations in which he indulged, but which are happily rendered for the most part innocuous by being unintelligible. And the too-evident intrusion of the writer's 'liberal' views on religion somewhat detracts from the pleasure with which one peruses an otherwise adequately written and interesting monograph.

The Life of Mozart. Translated from the German of Dr. LUDWIG NOHL by Lady WALLACE. (London, 1877.)

WE may agree with Lady Wallace that 'whatever is in any degree

likely to direct attention to the most melodious and lovely music in the world needs no excuse' (Pref. p. v.), and may therefore reasonably be grateful to her for thus presenting us with Dr. Nohl's memoir of Mozart in an English dress. But we may hope that she is less correct in her assertion that 'Mozart's works are little known and appreciated' (*ib.*). That fashion has sway in music as well as in matters of even greater importance it would be vain to deny; but 'Don Giovanni' is still the opera which of all others is the surest of all to draw full houses; 'Le Nozze di Figaro' and 'Il Flauto Magico' being second only to it in attraction to the English public; and 'Jupiter'¹ is still as much king of all symphonies as his namesake, or, may we say, godfather, was of Olympus in days of yore. If ever there was a 'heaven-born' genius, Mozart certainly seems entitled to the name. So far as our memory serves, he is the only infant prodigy whose mature fruit corresponded to its early blossom; but in his case the admiration which at six years of age he extorted from the Imperial Court at Vienna, when, after one of his performances on the pianoforte, Marie Theresa took him on her lap and kissed him, and the little Marie Antoinette gave him her hand so gracefully that he promised to marry her (i. 20) was but the forerunner of the more discriminating but equally enthusiastic confession of his superiority over all competitors which, twenty years later, Haydn took an honest pride in making (ii. 186-191). If he was marvellous as a performer at six, he was even more extraordinary as a composer at thirteen. He had already learnt in Italy 'that melody was the soul of music.' And he carried out the principle with a success so superior to that of the Italians themselves, that, at thirteen, he was engaged to compose an opera for La Scala, at Milan, the theatre whose audience was at that time the most critical in Europe. From that day to his death he was ceaselessly occupied with his pen, pouring forth concertos, operas, and masses with inexhaustible profusion, and in none falling below the high standard of excellence which he had aimed at from the first. Dr. Nohl devotes separate chapters to each of his best-known operas—to 'Le Nozze,' to 'Don Giovanni,' to 'Così fan tutti,' to the 'Flauto Magico,' and also to the Requiem. But through his analysis of these great works, and his account of their success, we have no space to follow him, as neither have we through those parts of his works which portray his hero's domestic life, and, it is with pain we add, his constant struggles with pecuniary embarrassment. The difficulties arising from a scanty income he might, indeed, have escaped if he had accepted the munificent offers with which the King of Prussia endeavoured to tempt him to settle at Berlin. But he regarded Vienna as his country, and replied that he could not leave his Emperor; though the treasury at Vienna was but poorly supplied, and Joseph was more profuse of compliments than of ducats. Much of his private life Dr. Nohl allows him to tell himself in the best way, by his letters to his wife and other relations. They give evidence of a singularly amiable

¹ The 9th Symphony, which musicians distinguish by this name.

and affectionate disposition. Nothing seems to have been able to provoke him but the blunders of an orchestra spoiling his music by bad time. Then, indeed, his patience was overpowered, and he would storm till he broke his steel shoe-buckles with his vehement stamping. But at all other times he was the gentlest of human beings. Dr. Nohl gives us the correct explanation of the story of the Requiem. The grey sepulchral-looking figure which gave the order is now known to have been the steward of a Count Walsegg, who had recently lost his wife, and who intended to produce Mozart's music as his own composition. The composer undertook the commission with a foreboding that it would be his last. 'I know,' said he, 'that I am writing this Requiem for myself.' And his words were too fatally verified. He was giving the last touches to the score when a sudden attack of some disease, apparently water in the chest, drove him to his bed, from which he never rose again. He died in November 1791, before he had completed his 36th year; but, young as he was, he had achieved a fame which Handel alone has equalled, and which it may almost be questioned whether even he has surpassed.

The Note-Book of Sir John Northcote, sometime M.P. for Ashburton, and afterwards for the County of Devon. Translated and edited, with a Memoir, by A. H. A. HAMILTON. (London: 1877.)

THE same feeling of the great importance of the transactions in which they were engaged, which led several members of the House of Commons in the Parliaments of Charles I. to publish their speeches, also prompted many of them to keep minute diaries of all the proceedings of the House. Some of these journals have already been given to the public; and this note-book of Sir John Northcote is not one of the least valuable contributions to the history of the time. Sir John was a man who took a somewhat eager part against the king, though Mr. Hamilton, in the extremely well-written and judicious memoir which he has given us as a preface to the note-book, exculpates him from the charge which Mr. Foster had brought against him of stating in the debates which followed the king's most ill-advised attempt to arrest the five members, that he would rather increase 'the jealousies existing between the king and the Parliament than diminish them'—a statement which originated in Mr. Foster's carelessness in transcribing the notes of Sir Simeon d'Ewes, which state plainly enough that Sir John was objecting to a motion of Sir H. Cholmeley, on that very ground, that it would only exasperate the present ill-feeling; Sir John's intentions in favour of the king on this occasion being so manifest that the tyrannical majority in the House would not suffer him to bring his speech to a conclusion. In general, the notes do not give us the substance of any of the speeches made; the only exception being made in reporting the discussion on the impeachment of the Lord-Keeper Finch. But they have preserved the accusations made against the different Ministers with a fulness that we can hardly find elsewhere. The charges against the Lord-Keeper Finch are given with great particularity (p. 83), as also those against Laud, which he calls 'the Scots' charge

against the Archbishop,' are set forth with a minuteness which shows utter want of all reasonable foundation (p. 78). One of the notes on p. 85 is remarkable as showing that the blunder of calling James's celebrated Chancellor 'Lord Bacon,' a title by which he had never been known for a single hour in his lifetime, was already prevalent. The book is edited with remarkable care and knowledge of the transactions of the time, and of the views of the Government leaders of both parties, and, as such, will be found a valuable aid in their labours by historians who know how to make use of it.

Notice sur la fondation et le développement de l'Association pour l'encouragement des Etudes Grecques en France. Par M. G. D'EICHTHAL. (Paris: Meissonnier et Cie., 1877.)

It is with satisfaction that we notice, as among the many hopeful signs of the condition of France, the labours of a society for the promotion of Greek studies in that country. These studies embrace language, literature, and art, and they appear to be in no small degree connected with the recollection of the interest taken by France and Frenchmen, even under the Bourbons, in the establishment of the Hellenic kingdom. About ten years ago the author of this notice, in conjunction with others now dead, gave the first impulse to the movement, according to the narrative here offered to us. A large number of subscribers was rapidly attained. The Academy interested itself in the question whether an attempt should be made to travel back to the method of pronunciation which prevailed before the nineteenth century. M. Duruy, when Minister of Public Instruction, viewed the foundation of the body with favour, and it obtained in 1870 a certificate of public utility, which confers on it a certain rank among institutions. It gives prizes for works of value by adults, and promotes by the same instrument the efforts of young men in the academic competitions (p. 50).

It has become a centre and a rallying point for all sympathies akin to its purpose. M. d'Eichthal confesses with regret that it has not yet been able to extend the limited share enjoyed by Greek studies in French education; but states that it has at least baffled and arrested a movement which had been in progress for the contraction of that limited share. We heartily wish well to the designs of the society; we believe that its purpose is of no common importance. The most superficial observer must be struck with the fact that for generations past Hellenic studies have been left to the Teutonic nations of Germany and England, and have languished sadly among the Latin peoples, so famous as they are and in so many ways. The spirit of liberty which breathes in the Greek literature has probably done more than its perfection according to the laws of art to maintain the study of it among ourselves. Mr. Pattison, in his *Life of Casaubon*, points out to us pretty clearly how the ancient learning, which promised to effect great things in France, was driven by religious intolerance in the seventeenth century to seek a home elsewhere. It passed from France to Holland, and from Holland to Germany, which still continues to be the chief seat of

literary labour, though it is perhaps in England that these studies are most largely applied to the cultivation of taste and the general discipline of the intellect. We fear that the society will have many obstacles to overcome, but we heartily wish well to its bold and enlightened effort.

Notes on the Churches of Kent. By the late Sir STEPHEN R. GLYNNE, Bart. With Illustrations. (London : John Murray.)

THIS volume, now presented to the public with a preface from the pen of Mr. W. H. Gladstone, M.P., consists of a series of notes based on actual personal inspection of 312 churches in Kent. The late Sir Stephen Glynne, we are told, was in the habit of devoting a certain number of weeks or months during every year to the examination of the architectural features of English churches far and near, and had actually completed a survey of more than 5,530 before death overtook him when actually busied with his unfinished task. The results of so much industry remain in the shape of a large mass of first-hand information, which will doubtless be of considerable value as a guide-book to future archæologists, if not, as we should think probable, to a much larger circle of readers interested in the parish churches described. The volume before us shows how thoroughly (not in the architect's sense, but in that of the man of taste) the writer was accustomed to do the work he had set about. Out of 424 parishes, as many as 312 are found mentioned here : but it is obviously a pity that the work is not quite complete. Modern and unimportant details which could be of no use to any one except the Ecclesiastical Commissioners or the Archdeacon are sometimes mixed with the descriptions of the architecture ; and it was, perhaps, a pity not to have removed these. The illustrative woodcuts are striking and good.

The Origin of Nations. In Two Parts. On Early Civilisations. On Ethnic Affinities, &c. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A. (London : Religious Tract Society.)

HERE is an excellent book, though it is small ; and one which we can warmly recommend. The author shows cause for believing that the introduction of man upon the earth is much more recent than impulsive Egyptologists would have it believed. He examines one by one all the separate civilisations with which history is acquainted : the Babylonian, the Phœnician, those of Asia Minor, and the far more extensive culture of the great empires, successive or contemporaneous, of Central Asia ; Assyria, Media and Persia, India ; or in Europe itself, that of the Etruscans in Italy, and of the early Celtic civilisation of our own islands. These he finds to agree one and all, if we except Egypt, in the hypothesis of a moderately early civilisation, demanding no vast antiquity of human existence ; and forming in their agreement a most powerful—we may even say, an irresistible corroboration of the early chronology of Scripture.

Similarly he examines the traces of affinity between the various races which make up the totality of the human race, and shows

that the great groups correspond remarkably with the express statements, and even with the indications given in the Scriptures.

In fact, we have a most able and powerful exhibition of the strong and almost conclusive evidence of their truthfulness drawn from these latest born of the sciences, and which were thought, not so very long ago, to be an armoury of weapons on the other side.

Tales illustrating Church History. England. Vol. 3. Mediæval Period. By the Rev. H. C. ADAMS. (Oxford and London : James Parker and Co., 1877.)

MOST of our readers will remember the earlier series of these tales, which used to appear in their yellow cloth covers, at short intervals, some of them, we believe, from the pen of the late Dr. Neale. The appearance of the volume before us probably indicates that the publication, which has been suspended for, we should suppose, fifteen or sixteen years, is to be recommenced ; and we are very glad to see it. We do not know that we can credit Mr. Adams' stories with any very high qualities : as is mostly the case with stories written with a prescribed purpose, and in which the costumes and manners of the period delineated are of more consequence than the puppets who constitute the machinery of the story. All these seem sufficiently correct, and the various religious crises are well illustrated. It is quite a book for the parish library.

Occasional Sermons. Preached before the University of Cambridge and elsewhere. With an Appendix of Hymns. By BENJAMIN HALL KENNEDY, D.D., Regius Professor of Greek, Cambridge, and Canon of Ely. (Bell and Sons ; Deighton, Bell and Co.)

THESE are sermons for scholars, and are, accordingly, philosophical and allusive in style, and walk habitually in that higher air of thought which, for ordinary congregations, would be a trifle difficult to breathe. The distinguished auditory before whom the greater number of them were delivered doubtless appreciated as they deserve both the subjects and the style. We cannot say that the metrical efforts which follow strike us as being the happiest efforts of Dr. Kennedy's muse, and we certainly do *not* like the *by no means capital* way in which they are printed, *i.e.* in uniformly small type.

The following from Sermon II., on 'The Moral Excellence of Jesus,' strikes us as worth quoting :—

'No man hath seen God at any time,' says the philosophic Theist ; but I believe in a Personal God ; and, if you ask me for the arguments on which I rest my belief, I reply, They are many and various, some drawn from my own consciousness, others from outward experience. If you further ask, Do any or all of these arguments amount to a demonstration of the existence of God? I reply, No ; for demonstration implies definition, and the Infinite defined is a contradiction in terms. Demonstration involves the assumption of a first principle ; but God Himself is prior to any principle, and therefore, by the nature of the case, indemonstrable. Believing that I have in my own consciousness, as guiding instincts, the ideas of existence, of freedom, and of duty or morality, I further believe that I have the idea of the perfection of each

of these ideas : that is, the idea of the Absolute and Infinite ; that is, the idea of God ' (p. 16).

WE have another and a very different type of University Sermons in *Sermons Preached in the Temporary Chapel of Keble College, Oxford, 1870-76.* (Rivingtons.) Whereas in the former the intellectual element of religion is chiefly dwelt upon, in these it is the *spiritual* element, and that, we think, wisely. If ever young men require spiritual strength, it is when they are first set as undergraduates to battle with the temptations which a University offers. The pulpit teaching of Keble College has been adapted, with great skill and earnestness, to meet that want ; and the result is a volume which no young man, be he cleric or layman, can peruse without being roused and stirred in heart and conscience. The sermons are by Mr. Talbot, the Warden ; by Mr. Mylne, now Bishop of Bombay, and then a Tutor of the College ; and by the other Tutors who occupied the pulpit in turn. We would notice especially the noble Sermon (VII.) on 'The Secret of Spiritual Strength,' by Mr. Mylne, as deserving an attentive perusal. The volume is a valuable one.

Sermons for the Saints' Days and Other Festivals. By the late Rev. JOHN KEBLE, Author of *The Christian Year.* (Oxford and London: James Parker and Co.)

THIS new volume of Mr. Keble's 'Sermons' will be most welcome. It would be an impertinence to attempt to praise them, and we simply note their appearance. If we should try to characterise in one word their specific quality, we should call them *winning* sermons. There is in them a remarkable *familiarity* and directness of speech, but it is the familiarity of the saint, who speaks with the most absolute plainness because he sees holy things so plainly, and it produces a kind of awe in the mind of the reader. We may mention as having struck us as specially beautiful, Sermon XVIII., for S. Matthias, on 'Reproof a Searching Trial.'

Boyle Lectures, 1876. What is Natural Theology? An Attempt to Ascertain the Cumulative Evidence of Many Witnesses to God. By ALFRED BARRY, D.D. (Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.)

THESE are assuredly very able, very learned, and very vigorous lectures. But it strikes us that they attempt too much for a small space. It is probably always a mistake to over-generalise. That which is visible and convincing when exhibited clearly and distinctly becomes indistinct when packed too closely ; loses its individuality, and with that its power of convincing. Now the great space of argument gone over by Dr. Barry in the book before us compels him so to condense his arguments, and to present them so constantly in mere outline, as to render his book less fitted for popular use than it really would otherwise be. But as a *conspectus* or bird's-eye view of the state of the argument it will not be without a real value to the student. The Summary of the Argument (pp. 309-327) is admirable, and would make an excellent brief tract.

An Attempt to Explain and Establish the Doctrine of Justification by Faith only. In Ten Sermons 'Upon the Nature and the Effects of Faith,' preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, by JAMES THOMAS O'BRIEN, D.D., late Bishop of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin. Fourth Edition. (Dublin: Hodges and Co.)

THE popular interest in controversial divinity has a way of shifting its ground; and the world has grown shyer of what used to be so much written upon, viz. the doctrine of 'Justification by Faith only.' Few books of any mark are written upon it now, and the one which is written reaches a fourth edition. This is the way we account to ourselves for the fact: not so much the merits of the work itself, though it has merits, and high ones, as the comparative paucity of publications on the subject, which cannot be called a popular one in itself, and is here treated in a manner of which the lengthiness and elaboration must have been far from popular. Unquestionably it is the production of a very able man—one who drives a keen, shining ploughshare of thought through all the aridities, and they are many, of his subject. But, able as his work is, it is an attempt to resuscitate a bygone view, and to deprive the Church of the experience of the last three hundred years. We may safely say that Bishop O'Brien's work is one of the best exponents possible of this so-prized doctrine—*articulus stantis aut cadentis Ecclesiæ*, as the great Reformer named it. But, after all, it is not safe for an individual or for a Church to found itself on anything less than the totality of Catholic doctrine. No Church may venture (if we may so express it) to have *favourite* doctrines. S. James found it necessary, even in the Apostolic age, to protest against the current travesty of S. Paul's doctrine of Faith. 'Wilt thou know, O vain man, that *faith without works is dead*?' That is exactly what the experience of later days has taught us. What has been the history of the Churches who took 'justification by faith only' for the whole Gospel? Look at Lutheranism now! or at the Churches of Geneva or Holland! The truth is, that the doctrine *in its place* is a Catholic verity, but taken apart from its correlatives, as if it were the whole Gospel, is a deadly snare. And, therefore, we are afraid of these attempts to isolate, and therefore probably to magnify, the doctrine. But the book will find its place in the theological library. By the way, we must utterly dissent from the Bishop's attempt (pp. 144, 145 and note v.) to turn the edge of S. James's argument by representing it as an *ad hominem* adaptation to the views of false-hearted Solifidians, and which virtually interpolates 'such' before 'faith' every time the Apostle names it.

Theism; being the Baird Lectures for 1876. By ROBERT FLINT, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. (Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood and Sons.)

THE author has, in ten lectures, reviewed fairly, and with adequate learning, the main provinces of the great theistic idea, and the chief lines of thought by which it is to be defended against opposition. He has not treated his subject historically; that element of it being,

VOL. V.—NO. X.

O O

we suppose, reserved for another series to be called 'Anti-Theistic Ideas,' and to be delivered this year. The lecturer meets the *à priori* objections to the existence of a God with great acuteness; but because, perhaps, of his own success in dealing with these objections *against* it, he does not think highly of the various *à priori* proofs *for* it. He does not, in fact, give them quite their full value.

The Superhuman Origin of the Bible inferred from Itself. The Congregational Union Lecture for 1873. By HENRY ROGERS. Fifth Edition. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1877.)

AN elaborate and lengthened argument, somewhat wordy and prolix, but substantially accurate. Since 'the Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants,' such an argument was very needful, from the Nonconformist point of view; and it is here very ably carried through. The lectures are evidently the work of a man of considerable knowledge, culture, and acuteness. He goes nearly, but not quite, to the bottom of the questions he handles: but on the part which he fails to deal with, often hangs the whole of the remainder. For example, he seems to begin with the English printed Bible of the 19th century, and to have omitted the preliminary inquiry as to what books constitute the Bible, and on whose authority they were constituted into a Canon. A controversialist should have remembered that this inquiry is not superfluous; as also that you may make too much of the 'Unity' of the Scriptures, to the exclusion of the correlative truth of their diversity. With these deductions the substantial argument will stand; and we are glad to see a book obviously modelled on Bishop Butler's great work thus popular.

Some Aspects of the Christian Ideal. Sermons by the Rev. L. CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Greek in the University of S. Andrews. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1877.)

CLEVER and scholarly sermons, containing much to occupy and interest the mind, but little to stir the affections or to touch the conscience; which present the religion of Christ in the garb of a purely human philosophy, albeit the loftiest of all the philosophies; and whose amount of doctrinal teaching may be judged of from the fact that some of them were preached 'during the writer's brief ministry in the Church of England, as Vicar of Milford, in Hampshire;' others were written for Episcopal congregations in S. Andrews, and others again were preached to Presbyterian congregations in the same place. They are like the famous tent of the fairy Peribanou which always accommodated its size to the number of its inmates; for these discourses would *fit* the Presbyterian as well as the Independent; perhaps even the Unitarian as well. If there is one whom they do *not* fit, it is probably the Episcopalian, to which the writer belongs.

The Christian Creed: its Theory and Practice. With a Preface on 'Some Present Dangers of the English Church.' By the Rev. STANLEY LEATHES, M.A. (London: Hodder and Stoughton.)

MR. STANLEY LEATHES has apparently published his Sermons on the

Creed in order to obtain an opportunity to lift up his testimony against Ritualism. When we remark that Mr. Leathes says that frequent Communion in themselves are 'neither right nor wrong, neither good nor bad,' but that, in certain circumstances, 'they can only be pernicious;' that he regards the institution of the priesthood as 'a chain of insupportable weight and slavish bondage,' and invites his hearers in capitals to CAST OUT the 'Roman leaven,' and so on, we shall have indicated plainly enough his state of mind when writing. The lectures themselves are better, and are very fairly good; save that there is no scintilla of 'sacramentalism,' of course. And there are novel speculations which we cannot think tend to edification.

The Conflict and the Crown. Plain Parochial Sermons. By the Rev. W. E. COGHLAN, B.A. With Preface by the Rev. BERDMORE COMPTON, M.A. (Skeffington and Son.)

THESE are excellent parochial sermons, but they are perhaps *too good* to be plain; the fact being that the great problems of religion and the advanced truths of theology are assimilated with a certain toil and difficulty of apprehension, and *cannot* be made, without injury to them, plain and level to the meanest capacity. The present rage for 'plain' sermons is, in too many instances, an indication of mental and spiritual sluggishness, and disinclination to make the effort to comprehend and to follow a train of sustained reasoning: it is a demand to be kept always upon mental spoon-meat, or words in four letters, and not to be at all indiscriminately yielded to. Mr. Coghlan's sermons, therefore, are none the worse because they must be attended to with a will in order to be apprehended. There is, perhaps, a tendency to mixture of metaphor, which is a besetting sin of preachers, and should be avoided. *E.g.*, on p. 56, 'death is the brink of the grave,' and on the very next line 'the last river.'

Sermons Reprinted from the 'Literary Churchman' (same publishers) are much more emphatically plain, and there is a striking quality of *directness* about most of them. They put questions sharply and briefly, enounce great truths in a way to strike and convince, and many of the writers show much skill in their use of that art of reiteration, that knack of saying the same thing over and over again in slightly varied forms, which, when rightly exercised, contributes so very largely to efficiency in preaching. These sermons show the right kind of plainness, and are sure to *tell* upon hearers.

Lectures on Preaching. By the Rev. PHILLIPS BROOKS, Rector of Trinity Church, Boston. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co.)
Nine Lectures on Preaching. By R. W. DALE, Birmingham. (Hodder and Stoughton.)

THESE are two courses of lectures delivered at Yale College, New Haven, during the course of 1877, on a foundation similar to our Bampton Lecture, called the 'Lyman Beecher Lectureship;' and, seeing that the students of Yale have now endured *two* distinct courses on this same subject of preaching, at an interval of not more than three or four months, we should think they must be about

saturated with it, and not desirous of hearing any more about it for a very long time.

And, to make the matter better, there is a very great family likeness between the two sets of lectures on the whole, and necessarily they have treated the same subjects and pursued similar lines of thought; but there the influence of personality has come in to 'differentiate' the two: the Englishman is more steady and business-like in his bit-by-bit evolution of his subject; the American, far more brilliant, with keener power of insight; the Englishman, again, far more discursive, and illustrates his subject from a wider range of culture and reading than his predecessor; but both are very able, very sensible, very useful courses of lectures, which are pleasant and improving to read, and must have been absorbing to listen to. We observe that Mr. Dale sets out by observing (p. 3), 'When a truth comes to me which has been re-asserted year after year for centuries, it comes with the sanction and authority, not of an individual man, but of successive generations of men;' and we are glad to have this on his own authority, because his sayings and doings in his native country would not of themselves have suggested that such was his belief.

Outlines of Biblical Psychology. By J. T. BECK, D.D., Prof. Ord. Theol. Tübingen. Translated from the Third Enlarged and Corrected German Edition, 1877. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.)

AN attempt, by a very competent and remarkably painstaking writer, to fix the sense of such terms as 'life,' 'soul,' 'heart,' which the figurative and anthropomorphic language of Scripture habitually employs. We can hardly call it a very successful attempt. The writer's style does not seem to us very clear. Such a passage as the following e.g. seems to us to be composed of wordy truisms: and, under a pretence of profundity, to convey no information at all:—

'To preserve unimpaired a thing's essential being and mode of being—in other words, its native possibilities and qualities, and, besides, to develop and assert them in every way—this was the primitive law and rule of all life. Hence in the case of the heart also it is true, in general terms, that *natural conception* of moral goodness and justice is only realised if the heart has retained its original being unimpaired, if its essence and powers are being completely developed in the way prescribed by its peculiar nature, and if its essential powers and functions retain the vitality of health, while the slightest deviation from this programme, either in excess or defect, is the beginning of evil and error. But in the concrete relations of life, the existence of good and evil is determined by the special peculiarities of the individual heart, which decide how a man can and will act in a given case; if the action is carried out with thoroughness and without injury to the inward well-being of the heart, it is good; if not, evil' (p. 128).

We should doubt if it were quite worth translating.

A Popular Exposition of the Epistles of the Seven Churches of Asia.

By E. H. PLUMPTRE, D.D. (Hodder and Stoughton, 1877.)

THIS is a very interesting work, but a very free 'exposition;' reading into the text for analogy or illustration much with which it has but

a slender and doubtful connexion, more after the manner of the sermon than the critical dissertation. These are, in fact, sermons; and, as sermons, there is much in them that is singularly varied and attractive. His identification of that woman, Jezebel, however, in the Epistle to Thyatira, with the wife of the Bishop, or 'Angel,' seems to us arbitrary; and his assertion of the literal, non-figurative character of what is said on this head, doubtful in the extreme.

A Treatise on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. By CHARLES ELLIOTT, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and Exegesis in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary of the North-West, Chicago, Illinois. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1877.)

No new word is likely to be spoken on the question of the Inspiration of Scripture, because the subject has been under attention for many hundreds of years, and well-nigh all possible modifications of the three leading hypotheses about it have been stated and considered. Therefore we need not be surprised to find, as we do find, a certain absence of originality in Dr. Elliott's work. He has included in his book chapters that have little direct connexion with it, e.g. that on 'The Beneficial Effects of the Bible upon the World.' In point of fact, Part III. contains the whole of the proper subject of the work, technically so called. Much of the remainder is apparently made up of the substance of lectures delivered to students, and the whole may be regarded as an intelligent and fairly complete exhibition of the general state of the question, without any very marked contributions to it on the writer's own part.

Principles of the English Church. A new Apology for the Church of England. A Series of Letters to a Friend. By the Rev. CHARLES HOLE. (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1877.)

'APOLOGIES' for the English Church, or for anything else, had need be of stronger material than this, if they are to bear much wear and tear. The book is well-intentioned, but weak; and the author levels down the 'principles' of the Church until he has left nothing to apologise for,—'naked in the matter of formulæ,' as Sandy Mackaye hath it.

The Merchant Taylors' Hebrew Grammar. The Formal Principles of Biblical Hebrew, as understood by Modern Semitists, stated in a manner suited to Beginners. By the Rev. C. J. BALL, M.A., Second Classical Master in Merchant Taylors' School. (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons.)

A WORK constructed on philosophical principles, and not unworthy of the ancient and famous school from which it comes, and in which we believe Hebrew is taught as a part of the ordinary school course.

A Knight of To-day. By L. T. MEADE. (Shaw.)

THIS is a book which, though only professing to be a 'tale,' we cannot forbear to notice for the noble beauty of its foremost character, Robert Archer. The author's style sometimes reminds us of George

Macdonald, and sometimes there is a *souçon* of Dickens—not of his humour but of his manner. However, there is no imitation, and the underlying principle is sounder than what we have in either of the above-named authors. Archer's knight-errantry is—as no doubt the title has revealed—a crusade against sin and misery, and it is conducted with common sense and upright justice, which makes the book wholesome reading. The plot is scarcely a probable one, but it is so worked out as to bring the conflict between good and evil into the highest relief; and the great beauty of it is that it is imbued throughout with the feeling that to be turned away from God is the only real ill. There is only one page that we feel out of keeping with the rest, and that is plainly an awkward expedient for bringing about the *dénouement*. All the rest is wise and clear-sighted, and sometimes rises into great nobleness.

Em; or, Spells and Counter Spells. By MARY BRAMSTON. (Marcus Ward.)

We mention this also as one of the best and most wholesome tales of this season. The hero and heroine are themselves interesting people; but the best part of the book is to be found in two characters, who only come in incidentally—a clergyman and his clever wife. They have married for love, but drift apart from lack of intellectual sympathy. He, busy in his parish work, and deeply religious, does not enter into her pursuits; and she, having early made up her mind that poor people are not her *forte*, leaves them to the district visitors, and devotes herself to intellectual culture, and amuses herself with sceptical speculations, not accepting the arguments he points out to her, because they were directed to the unbeliefs of an earlier day. Thus they drift apart, so far as sympathy is concerned, until it is discovered that the husband is suffering from a mortal disease. Then comes the long agony of the woman, in her incapacity to follow him in his sure faith and hope. The fog she has raised around herself comes between them, and her gaze cannot follow his. Better things come before the end; but the whole is so true to nature that it is a most wholesome lesson, not only to those who are tempted to walk in the light of the sparks that they have kindled, but to those who might use influence in time if they would try to understand the difficulties and objections, contemptible in themselves, yet which are to others deadly fruits of the tree of knowledge.

THE RETROSPECT OF 1877.

I.

FEW years have dealt more gently with men of distinction, both in Church and State, than the year which is now closed; but though it has scarcely removed any from the very foremost rank, still there are a few whose departure cannot but be chronicled. Naming first those who stood first in ecclesiastical position, we have to mention Bishop Powys, of Sodor and Man, whose energetic incumbency of the important Rectory of Warrington is not yet forgotten, though his promotion to his bishopric took place so long ago as 1854; and Bishop Trower, who was firstly Bishop of Glasgow, and then for a time Bishop of Gibraltar. The year has actually made no gap whatever in the number of those of our bishops who either are, or may become, Peers of Parliament; and the only loss among our deans has been that of Dean Williams, of Llandaff, who has been succeeded by Archdeacon Blossie. The roll of archdeacons, however, has lost (1) Archdeacon Thorp, years ago so familiar a name and face to all Cambridge men as Tutor of Trinity, and the first president of the Cambridge Camden Society. It is now more than thirty years (we think it was in 1844) that he resigned his tutorship, since which time he resided upon his living, Kemerton, near Tewkesbury, to which he had been presented in 1839 by the then Bishop (Monk) of Gloucester and Bristol. His archdeaconry he resigned in 1873. (2) The Venerable William Waring, Archdeacon of Ludlow since 1851, and Canon Residentiary of Hereford since 1867, a genial and kindly and somewhat scholarly clergyman of a school which entered but little into the controversies of recent times; and (3), and within a few days of our writing, Oxford and Christ Church have lost one of their most notable links with past days in Archdeacon Clerke, Archdeacon of Oxford since the year 1830, Canon of Christ Church since 1845, and whom Bishop Wilberforce continued in the office of examining chaplain which he had filled under Bishop Bagot during the exciting days of the early Tractarian movement.

After these we must name Sir Henry Williams Baker, Vicar of Monkland, near Leominster, so widely known in connexion with 'Hymns Ancient and Modern,' and some of whose original hymns, of extraordinary beauty, first appeared in the latest edition of that popular hymnal; Mr. Lysons, the well-known antiquary, Rector of Rodmarton, Cirencester, since 1833, and Hon. Canon of Gloucester, one of the many men of our day who have shown what the too-much-abused 'squarson' may both be and do.

It would, however, be a great omission were we to pass over the

decease, after years of failing health, accompanied nevertheless with unflinching work and industry, of Miss Anne Mackenzie, one of those who have well won high place among the women of Christianity. At the age of 41, after living the ordinary life of a Scottish lady of somewhat feeble health, she accompanied, in 1854, her youngest brother to Natal, sharing his labours and devoting herself specially to the education of the colonists' children, so that she was called his 'white sister,' though she gained much experience of work among the blacks—*i.e.* Kafirs.

When he became Missionary Bishop she again followed him, but only to learn that he had died of fever on his way to meet her. Returning home broken in health and apparently broken in heart, her true work sprang up out of devotion to his memory, and then rose to a noble height. Out of her endeavour to support the Kafir Mission in Natal, came first her 'Memoirs of Henrietta Robertson,' then that valuable magazine—the one thoroughly successful and popular missionary periodical which the Church of England has known—the 'Net,' with its immense agency for supplying the minor needs of Missions, and lastly, the foundation of a Bishopric in Zululand. Her great sympathy, her shrewd sense, her unflinching enthusiasm and power of interesting others, are all the more remarkable, inasmuch as she was an incessant sufferer who never knew a day of perfect health. She was certainly one of the foremost in promoting home agencies for the advancement of foreign Missions.

Of other names of wide interest we must specify particularly that of Sir James Kay Shuttleworth, who forty years ago was one of the founders of the first Training School for Schoolmasters in the country—that, namely, at Battersea, soon after taken up by the National Society—who was the inventor of the pupil-teacher system, who was for many years the (first) secretary to the Committee of Council on Education, and whose name is, perhaps, specially familiar in connexion with the long and fierce Management Clauses controversy. The same year which has removed Sir James has also taken away another worker in the cause of education—we refer to Miss Mary Carpenter, famous for her work in Reformatory Schools; and also Mrs. Caroline Chisholm, the promoter of female emigration.

From widely different spheres of literary celebrity we have lost Mr. Samuel Warren, once famous as a novelist, and Mr. Walter Bagehot, second to few in his line as a statisc. Two *genuine* centenarians have departed—Lady Smith, of Lowestoft; and Mrs. Bagster, of Old Windsor.

Abroad the losses have been more striking. France has lost her aged M. Thiers, who had contributed so much to the making of her history alike in writing—some would say inventing—that of the first Napoleon, and also by his own actions, whether in opposition or in office as an administrator. She has lost also M. Lanfrey, the historian; Le Verrier, her distinguished astronomer, who disputed the priority of discovery of the planet Neptune with the then young Cambridge Senior Wrangler Mr. Adams; two men of military fame, General Changarnier, first of Algerian, then of Parisian notoriety;

and Aurelle de Paladines, one of the very few who made more reputation than he lost in the dark days of the Franco-German War. Prussia has lost her aged General Wrangel, and the Old Catholics their Bishop Ketteler; Italy her Cardinal Patrizzi; America her historian, Mr. Motley; and, to come back again nearer home, the Roman Hierarchy in Ireland has lost its one really large-minded member, Dr. Moriarty, Bishop of Kerry—the one Roman Catholic Bishop who thoroughly appreciated the equity of the present English rule in Ireland, and was not afraid to say so.

II.

Probably there has been no year since 1850 which opened with so many anxious forebodings on the part of English Churchmen as the now ended 1877. The appeal in the Ridsdale case was about to be heard, and there was the possibility of the judgment resulting in a dangerous collision between many of the most influential of the clergy and the civil executive. Mr. Pelham Dale had been deprived. Mr. Tooth had been condemned. No one knew what was coming next.

At such a time it was cheering to see that the spiritual work of the Church was in no way abated. Little public notice was taken of it, but work was being carried on which, had it only been a few years back, would have been in everybody's mouth. We refer especially to those missions which were taking place throughout the country, which, whether for their numbers, or for the scale upon which they were carried out, or for their success, were altogether unprecedented. Those at Manchester, Chester, and Clifton deserve especial commemoration. At Manchester, the Mother Church of the diocese was, as it ought to be, the centre of all, and the opposition which preceded it served only to bring out into the more prominence the inflexible resolution of the Dean, and to emphasise still further the success of the undertaking.

On January 22 Mr. A. Tooth, who on the 13th had been pronounced 'contumacious and in contempt' for ignoring the inhibition of Lord Penzance, was imprisoned in Horsemonger-lane Gaol, and there were many churches, and those with not the least influential congregations, where the prayers of the Church were desired for 'Arthur Tooth now in prison for conscience sake.' On February 17 came his release, brought about by no submission on his part, but by the feeling in high quarters of the absurdly incongruous spectacle of a personally blameless clergyman subjected to an imprisonment even less considerate than in the case of a first-class misdemeanant.

In the course of March a memorial to the Primate and the Bishops generally, signed by about eighty leading clergy, and headed by the Dean of S. Paul's, reciting the peculiarities of the existing situation, and pointing out that the true remedy lay in appeal to 'the Living Voice of the Church,' was drawn up and presented to His Grace on the 27th.

On May 12, the decision in the Ridsdale case was given, of which the less need be said here, because of the very full discussion of it

which was given in our number of last July. It may, however, be added that, while it condemned the use of the 'vestments,' the majority of those churches in which they were used still continue to use them, without, up to the year's end, any one attempting to apply this decision to their case. Mr. Ridsdale avoided further collision by obeying his Diocesan's wishes as regards the ritual of S. Peter's, Folkestone. But though Mr. Ridsdale acted with this moderation, there were others who took a different course. On May 30, about two hundred clergy met at the Westminster Palace Hotel, under Mr. T. T. Carter's presidency, and resolved to disregard the judgment on the grounds of its being 'contrary to the plain meaning of the Prayer Book.' Later on, July 2, Mr. Mackonochie held a meeting at the Freemasons' Hall of those who, like himself, regarded a final breach with the State as the only remedy for existing complications. At this meeting Archdeacon Denison was a prominent speaker. And on June 29 the Court of Queen's Bench decided that the proceedings under the Public Worship Regulation Act, under which Mr. Pelham Dale had been deprived, were null and void *ab initio*, so that he must be reinstated in his benefice, and the costs incurred fall back on those who were responsible for the suit. And so things stood at the close of the season of 1877.

Meantime, the Parliamentary proceedings as to matters connected with the Church had not been very numerous, though far from unimportant. An insidious attempt was made to get the small end of the wedge in with a view to the ultimate legalisation of the marriage of widowers with their sisters-in-law, by legalising in England such marriages as had been thus contracted in the colonies, and though opposed by Government a majority of 192 to 141 was snatched on February 28 in the Commons, but the Bill proceeded no further.

On March 13, the Duke of Richmond introduced the Government Burials Bill, which we fully discuss in the present number, and which, after a vigorous effort to carry it, was withdrawn on June 21. During the Whitsun recess, a memorial against the Dissenters' attack on our burial-grounds was signed by more than *fourteen thousand* clergy; certainly the most numerously-signed memorial which has ever proceeded from the English clergy on any subject or any occasion.

The withdrawal of Mr. Cross's Bill for the creation of new sees was no doubt a serious misfortune, but it may have its compensations in the further ripening of public opinion on the subject. During the Session and in the recess important public meetings have been held in the districts affected by the proposed Bill, as *e.g.* Nottingham, Halifax, and Wakefield, where the keenest interest was evinced—a fact of special importance, considering that it is something new for manufacturing centres to show such marks of Church life, and to be so anxious for the honour of becoming See towns. There seems no doubt that the needful funds will soon be raised, so that ere long we shall have six new dioceses—certainly the greatest step in Church extension since the Reformation—and these in no way provided by the State, but only *permitted* by it, and, like our original endowments, the fruit of voluntary zeal. By the bequest of a private

gentleman, the late Mr. T. Headley, the endowment for a separate see for Northumberland is already virtually secured. The people of Bristol, too, are moving for the restoration of their ancient diocese, towards which the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol is ready to surrender 500*l.* a year, and a considerable sum has already been promised in the neighbourhood. A movement is also beginning for the subdivision of the huge Diocese of London. The assistance rendered by the Additional Curates' Society to the increase of the Home Episcopate ought to be cordially acknowledged; and Mr. Ingram notifies the encouraging fact that within *nine months* a total of nearly 100,000*l.* has been offered for this purpose.

The later portion of the year has been marked first by a most numerous attended Church Congress (the seventeenth) held at Croydon, with the Primate as chairman, and next by the largest number of Diocesan Conferences ever held. In fact, there are now but few dioceses which have failed to organise themselves in this manner, among which number, strange to say, the diocese of London is one, and one of the next most important dioceses in England, that of Durham, is another. Then, in November (the 19th) a decision was given by the Queen's Bench that Lord Penzance's Court at Lambeth, for contempt of which Mr. A. Tooth had been sent to prison, had really no jurisdiction; so that here again, as in Mr. Dale's case, the proceedings were null and void *ab initio*, and so the second adventure under the Public Worship Regulation Act issued in a *fiasco*, and Mr. Tooth remained in possession of the ground. Whether future proceedings will succeed better remains to be seen.

The year 1877 has, as we have already stated, seen no vacancies in English sees, excepting that of Sodor and Man, to which Mr. Rowley Hill was appointed, and whose consecration took place in York Minster on August 24. But the year has seen two new dioceses added to the Church—that of Truro, to which Dr. Benson was consecrated at S. Paul's Cathedral, on May 25; and that of S. Alban's, to which, Bishop Claughton being translated (he was enthroned in S. Alban's Abbey, June 12), Canon Thorold was appointed, and consecrated in Westminster Abbey, July 25. On S. Thomas' Day three Bishops were consecrated in Westminster Abbey—Dr. Trollope, Archdeacon of Stow since 1866, as Suffragan of Nottingham, in the room of Bishop Mackenzie, who has resigned after seven years' service; Dr. V. Trench, as Bishop of Lahore; and Dr. Titcomb, as Bishop of Rangoon; the former a missionary clergyman of experience, the latter a well-known and respected clergyman of the diocese of Winchester, of whom we can only say that we wish he were young enough to give hope of longer service in his new sphere.

It yet remains to add a word upon the subject which in 1876 caused such bitter controversy, but on which during 1877 so little has been said—we mean the matter of education. No one will expect us to lament the extinction of the Birmingham Education League, which took place on March 28, but we must record the loss of Canon Fry, of Leicester, who had been the successful trainer of many a valuable teacher before training colleges were thought of. For the

rest, we are glad to say that Church Schools have been holding their own successfully against the Board School competition, and that the number succumbing before that competition has sensibly diminished. Our whole loss at present reaches something less than four per cent. of our schools, while, *per contra*, the school accommodation supplied by the Church far exceeds what it was in 1870. Lord Sandon's Act of 1876 came just in time for many parts of the manufacturing and mining districts, where, but for Section X., which authorises guardians to pay school fees when needed, it is difficult to understand how children could be kept at school at all. One bold movement must be specified, that, namely, of the Metropolitan Church School Fund, by which it is proposed to raise a capital of 50,000*l.*, and an annual income of 2,000*l.*, to be spent in aiding embarrassed schools in poor districts, and so saving them from collapse, or falling into the hands of School Boards. Such a fund might well be raised by every diocese in the kingdom.

As to Board Schools, Mr. Sampson Lloyd's return has just appeared, giving details of their religious instruction in the metropolis and eight other large centres of population, in which naturally Birmingham does not find a place. The return is interesting and valuable, especially as illustrating the importance of the continued existence of the Church Schools in holding up a standard of what religious instruction ought to be, for we observe that the various courses—so far as they go—follow in the main the lines laid down by the diocesan inspectors of religious education. On the whole, the teaching is limited to Holy Scripture, but Liverpool and Manchester add hymns, and Liverpool further requires prayers to be learned by heart. The pupil-teachers are not forgotten, and Manchester and Exeter require the head-teachers to give a certain portion of time weekly to their religious teaching. For the rest we must refer our readers to the return itself.

Under the head of Education we may be allowed to speak of the work of the very valuable 'Ordination Candidates Exhibition Fund' (No. 7 Whitehall). Thirty additional Exhibitions have been voted in 1877, raising the total number since its foundation to 97. The total number of applications received in 1877 was 124; the total since its foundation, 301. The income during 1877 has been 1,436*l.*, against 1,286*l.* in 1876. Of the exhibitors, 16 have been ordained, 52 are under education, 16 are about to matriculate, having only just been appointed: thus accounting for 84 of the 97. Of the twelve who remain, four have resigned in order to take Colonial work, and the rest, from various causes, failing health, &c., have failed to take up or to retain their exhibitions.

One effort of the year, which has not yet proved successful, but which we hope will do so in 1878, we must refer to, and that is the establishment of a daily penny newspaper, which should give, in addition to the usual contents of such a paper, due attention to Church matters. So soon as a capital of 30,000*l.* has been raised, the 'Daily Express' will reappear, and we hope it will be soon.

III.

Turning next to the proceedings of the Canterbury Convocation, we notice that in spite of—it surely could not have been *because of*—the prevailing excitement as to matters ecclesiastical at the opening of the year, the Archbishop desired that the usual February sittings should be intermitted. Lent beginning so early—Ash Wednesday fell on February 14—His Grace was unwilling to call the clergy away from their homes, lest the performance of their parochial duties should suffer. Altogether, the Convocation only sat eight days in the whole year. We have also to notice a circumstance which has come even more strongly into view this year than previously, namely, a tendency on the part of the Upper House to continuously increasing brevity—pardon the Hibernicism—in their debates. We do not mean to say that the bishops are less anxious for the Church's welfare, or to imply that they take counsel together for that welfare less frequently or less earnestly than before. On the contrary, we are constantly hearing of their being summoned to Lambeth to advise His Grace or receive advice from him. But their public discussions as a House of Convocation seem thinning out—a course which is much to be regretted, inasmuch as it withholds from the Church at large that full expression of the mind of the collective Episcopate which it most unquestionably desiderates, and to which it looks with respect. *De non apparentibus et de non existentibus eadem est ratio*, and if this tendency continue it will be to the serious diminution of the moral weight of the Episcopate as a whole. These private debates may doubtless do much to clear up their lordships' minds on many points of anxiety, but the mind of the public also counts for something in these days; and now that the laity not only read the debates of the Lower House, but also see and hear the clergy so largely in the Diocesan Conferences, it is a real mistake in policy for the bishops to forego their opportunity of reminding the laity that there is such a thing as the voice of the Episcopate as well as the voice of the Priesthood.

Convocation sat for four days in April, from the 24th to the 27th inclusive, and the Upper House appointed a Committee to consider the representation of the clergy in the Lower House 'with a view to ascertaining the expediency and possibility of obtaining an addition to the number of the proctors and their distribution, the qualification of the voters, and the mode of election.' This was practically the Archbishop's answer to the petition headed by the Dean of S. Paul's, which insisted that an appeal to 'the Living Voice of the Church' was the true remedy for existing complications. The heads of a Clergy Discipline Bill, urged upon the Upper House by a *gravamen* from the Lower, were considered.

Both Houses concluded their Report on the Rubrics, the Lower House recommending that there should be no legislative action unless the 'burning questions' were settled. The same House also

passed a resolution in support of the Government Burials Bill ; it remonstrated against the course taken in Scotland by Bishop Beckles, who had been assuming a pseudo-episcopal oversight of certain congregations in Scotland; and it passed the report of one of its own Committees on the Increase of the Episcopate in England. Canon Miller proposed that the House should consider the subject of obtaining the views of the laity in connexion with Convocation, and Lord Alwyne Compton's resolution in favour of a Lay House outside Convocation, but not part of Convocation, was agreed to.

In the four days' session in July (3rd to 6th inclusive), the 'Priest in Absolution' occupied a good deal of time. The Upper House sent down to the Lower a resolution on the subject of confession, drawn by Bishop Wilberforce in 1873, and passed by the Upper House, in which its use in the Church of England is somewhat minimised. After a decidedly feeble debate, the Lower House accepted it 'generally.' The Archbishop announced that though the Committee of the Upper House on the Reform of Convocation had not agreed to a formal report, they had arrived at the conclusion that the number of elected proctors should be increased, and that many of the alterations desired were within the power of the President to make, and that before the next election he would make them. The Lower House agreed to recommend an alteration in the Ornaments Rubric, by which they proposed to make the use of the cope permissive, but not that of the chasuble. As no question of principle underlies this distinction, the wisdom of this recommendation depends entirely upon the probability or otherwise of its being accepted as a basis of pacification. So far as we are at present informed, the proposal does not seem to have attracted much attention. And with a re-affirmation of the resolution of the April Session on the Burials Bill, the somewhat scanty proceedings of the House terminated for 1877.

IV.

In the Colonial and Missionary Churches events have been few during the past year. Our chronicle will, we hope, present to our readers everything of importance that has happened.

AUSTRALIA.—From Western Australia we have the first impressions of Bishop Parry, who finds his new diocese undergoing the same process of disestablishment, and withdrawal of annual Government subsidies, which his old diocese of Barbadoes has experienced—with this material difference, that the Churchmen of Perth, having been only partly dependent on State aid, more readily develop the spirit of self-help ; and are not only making provision for endowment, but have determined to build a new Cathedral, the fabric, of the 'Early-Colonial style of architecture,' which has done duty in that capacity since Perth first became a penal colony, being pronounced 'beyond remedy.'

Bishop Matthew Hale, after twenty years' labour in Perth, and a previous service as Archdeacon of Adelaide (in which position he had the credit of making almost the solitary attempt on the part of

the Church to evangelise the Australian Blacks), was summoned by the diocese of Brisbane to become its chief Pastor. Brisbane is the most laggard of all Colonial dioceses in the matter of self-help, and, after a year's experience, the Bishop plainly told his people that he must leave a diocese that had neither life nor energy. This courageous reproof has had some effect; the diocese has prayed the Bishop to remain, and has promised amendment, and has already given some tokens of its sincerity.

In Melbourne Bishop Moorhouse has more than justified the expectations of those who knew him in England. He has made no secret of his surprise and disappointment at the tone of Churchmanship and the condition of Church matters in Victoria, and his honest utterances have won their way. He has set his heart on building a grand Cathedral, and has described the functions which he has witnessed in S. Paul's Cathedral (of which he was a Prebendary), and he has told his people that he desires to see similar attractions to devotion and enthusiasm in Melbourne. The consequence has been that a site has been procured, large sums of money have been promised, and a stately Cathedral has been determined on. Long before it is built, we expect the whole standard of the diocese, even in its remotest parts, to be visibly raised.

The diocese of North Queensland has not yet been constituted, but the Bishop of Sydney is in England for the purpose, chiefly, of finding a suitable Bishop.

We have heard with much regret that the noble Bishop of Newcastle has received a grave warning that his labours, which have been uninterrupted since he landed in 1848, must now be regulated by some consideration for his own strength and health. Whenever Bishop Tyrrell lays down his pastoral staff, he will leave behind him a living epistle in a diocese which has had exceptional—almost unparalleled—care at the hands of its bishop.

NEW ZEALAND AND THE PACIFIC.—In New Zealand we regret to have to record a distinct and clearly-marked decadence. A clergyman in the diocese of Christ Church, the Rev. H. E. Carlyon, has been sentenced by the bench of Bishops, four in number, of whom Bishop Suter, of Nelson, was president, to a month's suspension, for views and practices which were declared to be inconsistent with the teaching of 'the Church of New Zealand.' The Court which has thus sentenced Mr. Carlyon, without allowing an opportunity of defence or of explanation, would condemn at least one-third of the Clergy at home; and it is sad that the first Colonial Church to adopt a narrower standard than that of the Mother Church, should have been the province founded by so wise and far-seeing a prelate as Bishop Selwyn.

The Diocese of Waiapu has elected the Rev. E. Stuart, an ex-Church Missionary Society Missionary in Calcutta, as successor to Bishop Williams.

In the Hawaiian Islands Bishop Willis still pursues his labour of love, and would be much comforted by the arrival of one or two priests, to whom he offers a suitable maintenance.

Over the sister island Church of the Pacific the Rev. J. R. Selwyn was consecrated Bishop on February 18 at Nelson; and a special service was held in Lichfield Cathedral on Saturday, February 17, at the same hours at which the service was held at the antipodes. The real founder of the Mission interceding under the roof of S. Chad for his own son, called on to carry on the work commenced by himself twenty-five years ago, on the other side of the globe, was a suggestive sight, and reminds us how in these latter days a few faithful sons of our Mother Church have been allowed to win for their Lord the utmost parts of the earth.

AMERICA.—We are half afraid that the Church in Canada is not progressing as vigorously as we could wish. We have seen in Episcopal Charges and other like documents congratulations that their dioceses are untainted by Ritualism and are unruffled by controversy. Peace is a great blessing, but there is truth in the hackneyed quotation, *Solitudinem faciunt; pacem appellant*; yet, with the exceptions of Fredericton and Newfoundland, if the North American Churches be advancing in spiritual life, in influence, or a spirit of independence, the signs thereof have not reached us. Nova Scotia *e.g.*, now in its tenth decade, is our oldest Colonial diocese. We think that in a century a diocese of Anglo-Saxon colonists ought to be self-sustained; yet it draws more than 2,500*l.* a year from the treasury of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Montreal, again, which, as part of the original diocese of Quebec, has had hardly a briefer existence, and enjoys, moreover, considerable endowments, draws 1,200*l.* per annum from the same society. If we are not mistaken, Canada wants some fresh blood from the ranks of the more vigorous of the home clergy. Of those who have done good service in North America many have been removed; during the past year the death of Jasper Hume Nicolls, D.D., for more than thirty years the Principal of Lennoxville College, has created a great blank. Most of the clergy of Quebec and Montreal had been his pupils. In Fredericton Bishop Medley has made the meeting of his Synod an occasion of delivering a charge and a sermon which have been published, and ought to be known and valued in every branch of the Church. The terrible conflagration in S. John has necessarily hampered the resources of the diocese. The diocese of Newfoundland, which was deprived of Bishop Feild in 1876, is again without a bishop, Bishop Kelly having in July last resigned a position to which he was physically unequal. Up to this time no successor has been selected.

In the WEST INDIES the Diocese of Nassau is still without a bishop. Dr. Venables died on October 8, 1876, and no income, save 68*l.* per annum, was available for his successor. By the prompt efforts of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel an immediate income of 500*l.* per annum has been provided for this island see, and a similar amount has been secured to Newfoundland by endowment. Thus, these long vacant dioceses offer only hard work and bare maintenance, but there must be many priests who would not be disheartened by these

accidents, and would respond to a call if made to them by competent authority. We know that the spirit which moved Bishops Feild and Venables is not extinct, so that we are forced to ask whether that spirit approves itself to those to whom the selection of their successors is entrusted. If it does, it is hard to account for the long-continued orphanhood of these sees.

In Antigua Bishop Jackson, by munificent example and by precept, is preparing for the endowment of the see when with his own episcopate the present grant shall terminate. In Trinidad Bishop Rawle has secured an insignificant endowment for himself, which he declares to be sufficient. In both of these dioceses efforts are being made for the support of the several parishes, as, by the removal of their clergy, they become amenable to the Disestablishment Act.

We fail to see like forethought in Barbadoes and Jamaica. In the former, where the local legislature has set up a little establishment of its own, and votes the bishop's salary, we read of threatened curtailment of works, of withdrawal from the Pongas mission; and we know not what will be the fate of Jamaica whenever Bishop Courtenay is removed, and with him the income which maintains him.

From AFRICA we have news of the successful assembling of the second Provincial Synod without the presence and counsel of those two leading minds who created the whole organisation of South Africa—Bishops Gray and Cotterill. The result filled all hearts with thankfulness; and since its close the Metropolitan has been hard at work in holding visitations, not only in his own diocese, but in the Free State, the Transvaal, Natal, and Grahamstown. Exhausting work, no doubt, but how different from Bishop Gray's toilsome journeys twenty-nine years ago over the same region.

In Capetown Dr. J. M. Arnold has commenced a work among the Moslems for which he possesses singular qualifications, and already with surprising results. Bishop Webb will now be relieved from the care of the Transvaal, rapidly becoming not only *de jure* a British colony, as by annexation it is, but *de facto* the home of a large number of English immigrants. The Rev. H. B. Bousfield, Vicar of Andover, has been elected Bishop of Pretoria, and is to be immediately consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the request of the Bishop of Capetown and his suffragans. One loss the African Church has sustained during the past year—Anne Mackenzie, who entered into her rest on February 12, and of whom we have spoken in our general obituary. The war in Zulu-land has scattered the work that had been carried on, and at present nothing can be more discouraging than the prospect north of the Tugela River.

Bishop Steere, by his short visit to England, both recruited his shaken health and raised up fresh interest in his work wherever he went. The work in Central Africa is only beginning, and it is gratifying to think that for once the Church is not the last religious body to make her presence felt.

In Madagascar Bishop Kestell-Cornish is rapidly extending and consolidating the Church. His difficulty is to refuse the demands for teachers which comes from all sides; but he wisely refuses to

paralyse his work by scattering resources which ought to be concentrated. It seems very probable that in this island a native ministry will be sooner at work than has been the case elsewhere. The college, under the Rev. F. A. Gregory, will, we hope, within two or three years, be in a condition to send out a regular stream of Malagasy deacons and priests.

In CEYLON Bishop Copleston has won his way by the simple force of his Christian suavity and Christian firmness combined. The faction raised against him, more at home than in his diocese, has had to succumb. The Church Missionary Society have learned to their cost that not a few of their supporters would have nothing to do with the autocratic policy of their committee. The missionaries who stood out so long against their bishop saw their incongruous position and submitted themselves; and all, we hope, were impressed by the admirable—almost unexampled—bearing of the bishop himself, who, throughout the whole controversy, never yielded a jot of the claims which he felt bound to make, and never wrote or uttered a harsh or uncharitable word. On May 1 an attempt was made in the House of Commons, on the motion of the Wesleyan Alderman McArthur, to discontinue the payment of the Bishop's stipend; and the C.M.S. has suggested that as a State Bishop cannot be a missionary, therefore it should be allowed to maintain a bishop of its own for its missions in Ceylon. Bishop Copleston has shown the worth of both of these movements; for in a recent letter to the *Guardian* from the Warden of Keble, we hear of his ministering to four congregations in succession in English, Portuguese, Tamul, and Cinghalese—a Mezzofanti-like gift which promises to make him a second Pateson.

INDIA.—If we have left India to the last it is only because of our sense of its stupendous importance. When 1877 began it had three bishops; at its close seven, between Peshawur and Moulmein. On March 11, Dr. Caldwell and Dr. Sargent were consecrated in Calcutta Cathedral, and became coadjutors to the Bishop of Madras during his pleasure. They are essentially curate bishops, liable at any moment to be reduced to the ranks of simple missionaries, and to be limited to priestly functions, even to entire suspension from the exercise of all ministerial duties, at his mere will. That such autocratic treatment will never be experienced we are sure, but this does not alter their position. They have of right no seat nor vote in the Synod of the Indian Bishops, and on the avoidance of the See of Madras their episcopal functions would *ipso facto* cease. It will not do to repeat this arrangement. Tolerated in the case of Tinnevely, in view of the urgency of the particular missions, an episcopate of this sort, on an extended scale, would be a portentous solecism. But, unfortunately, we are not in India free to do as we would and as we ought. If it were a *tabula rasa*, no one would desire to see a Church and Episcopate in Hindustan such as now exists. In 1814 it was a great thing to get a bishop sent to India at all, and those who promoted the plan were prepared to swallow all the incredible Erastianism which we described at length in our April number of 1877. But things are now altered; the Establishment remains; 160 chaplains are

maintained at an average cost of some 900*l.* a year apiece to the Indian Revenue—of these three are bishops, and two more bishops have been recently added. But by the Royal Proclamation of 1858, all persons in authority under the Crown have been strictly enjoined to abstain from interference with the religious belief or worship of any of Her Majesty's subjects; so that a strict interpretation of this proclamation removes the Indian bishops and chaplains from all contact with missionary work, and limits them to the spiritual care of those servants of the Crown, military and civil, who hold India for the Crown. Of course, this obviates charges of injustice in taxing a heathen people for the support of those who shall try to convert them against their will; but while legislation stands still, India moves, and that rapidly. The 160 chaplains are now only a fraction of the clergy of India, and the people to whom they nominally minister probably do not exceed 80,000, civil and military. The missionary clergy now number more than 300, of whom just one-half are of pure native blood, and their congregations number 120,000. There are also about 60 other clergymen who minister to Europeans either in towns or on plantations and railways. All this is the more important, since, owing to causes we need not specify, hardly anything can be of less certain duration than the Indian Establishment; so that in the Native Church we have the only Christian body of whose continuance we can be assured. Bishop Cotton, in his famous charge, declared that he looked forward to the time 'when we, the foreign Theodores and Augustines, shall be succeeded by Indian Stigands and Lanfrancs.' All this points to an extension of the Episcopate, not on the lines of an increased number of military chaplains, but on those of a rapidly developing Native Church; and at the time of Bishop Milman's death plans were formed in England, of which the Bishop was cognizant, for a large increase of the Episcopate in those portions of British India which lie outside the territory touched by the parliamentary settlement of the Indian Church. These plans contemplated the Missionary development as the *ergon*, and the Establishment functions as the *parergon*, of the new bishops, who, it was intended, should live with no sort of pomp on the income of a junior chaplain; but the liberty of the Episcopate in India is strangely circumscribed. It is almost incredible that the Indian Bishops could not consecrate Drs. Caldwell and Sargent without a Royal Mandate and a Commission from the Archbishop of Canterbury; and consequently the consent of the civil authorities is necessary before any independent bishops could be consecrated. This consent was sought and was refused. At the same time, India started, as a memorial to Bishop Milman, an endowment for a new see of Lahore, and the diocese of Winchester commenced the task of raising an endowment for a new see of Rangoon. About 10,000*l.* was raised by Winchester for Rangoon, and a like sum by India, by the Diocese of Oxford (in which Bishop Milman was for many years beneficed) and by friends, for Lahore, and to each of these funds the three Church Societies—Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, Society for Propagation of the Gospel, and Colonial Bishopsrics Fund

—contributed 10,000*l.* To each of the bishops are added the status and emoluments of a Government Chaplain, *and only on this condition could the necessary permission be obtained for the founding of the new sees*, so that the Bishops of Lahore and Rangoon are servants of the Crown, and amenable to all the rules which bind such servants. Moreover, eminent lawyers rule that the boundaries of the original diocese of Calcutta are not fixed things, but that of their own nature they expand with the Indian Empire, so that no new diocese can be formed without the consent of Parliament, which was a co-founder of the original diocese—a theory equally ingenious and amazing, but which may be consistent with the ideas on which the abnormal establishment of the Indian Episcopate took place sixty years ago. The see of Rangoon is wholly, and that of Lahore almost entirely, composed of territory which was no part of the original see, so that but for this theory there was no legal hindrance to the establishment of bishoprics wholly unconnected with the Government in those two areas. But the old jealousy of any ecclesiastical organisation in India not under secular control, and even liable to suppression, is shown by the provision made in the Letters Patent for the appointment and maintenance of archdeacons of Lahore and Rangoon, who, like the bishops, must be Government chaplains. Happily, both the prelates who were consecrated on S. Thomas' Day are men of genuine missionary zeal, the Bishop of Lahore having given many years of his life to the work in connexion with the Church Missionary Society; and Bishop Titcomb, in a metropolitan parish, having always aided missions heartily. Meanwhile, this noblest field of work is attracting from our seats of learning those men of unusual ability who have hitherto been the great want of India. The Cambridge University Mission to Delhi, in connexion with the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, is a most cheering fact. In thus sending out worthy representatives of her highest culture, the University is rendering most material service to the Church, both at home and abroad. The two first members of this missionary brotherhood left in October; others are studying in Cambridge, with the view of joining them next year, and it is hoped that in 1880 at least ten Cambridge graduates will be carrying on missionary work over a portion of North India, of which Delhi will be the centre. The spot is well chosen; it was the scene of the murder of the missionaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel at the time of the Mutiny, and was one of the first places to be reoccupied when peace was restored. It is, therefore, consecrated by the memory of faithful martyrs, and has been well cared for by those who succeeded to their labours. A mission has been carried on in this historic city for the last twenty years; and so good a judge as Sir Bartle Frere declared that Delhi, when he visited it with the Prince of Wales, promised in a very few years to become a second Tinnevely.

The mission of Chota Nagpore was visited by the Bishop of Calcutta in November, and 2,000 Kohls were confirmed by him. Chota Nagpore was one of the last places visited by Bishop Milman, who then confirmed 1,500 persons.

Bishop Mylne has been sent to Europe to recover from the effects of a very severe fever, brought on by excessive work when conducting a mission among British soldiers. He is much better now, and will come to England in the summer to attend the Lambeth Conference, which is fixed for July 1. The importance of this gathering will far exceed that of its predecessor in 1867. Both the Colonial and the Missionary Churches have grown enormously in the last eleven years, and in that growth questions have arisen which can only be settled by the inherent authority of the Episcopate gathered from all parts of the world. Let us hope that when we come to sketch our Church history of 1878, this second Lambeth Conference may fill a page worthy of itself and of the great Anglican Communion which now, in spite of all hindrances, is exhibiting such a marvellous vitality, and which seems, under God's blessing, to be going forth to do its share in obeying the great command to replenish the earth and to subdue it, in the name of Him who is the second Adam.

INDEX TO VOLUME V.

ABB

- ABBOTT**, Dr., review of his work *Through Nature to Christ*, 164 *sq.* See *Through Nature to Christ*
 Absolution, 197, 201, 206, 207, 210, 218, 226 *sq.*; form of, in the Greek Church, 203
 Abyssinia, ordinations of the Church of, 276
 Adams, Rev. H. C., his *Tales illustrating Church History*, 547
 Adrian, Cardinal, 124
 Africa, the Church in, 565
 Albigenes, the, 301 *sq.*
 America, North, the Church in, 564
 Andrewes, Bishop, on ordination, 267
 Argyll, Bishopric of. See *Ewing*
 Arnold, Mr. Matthew, his *Literature and Dogma*, 167
 Australia, ecclesiastical affairs in, 563

BALL, Rev. C. J., his *Merchant Taylors' Hebrew Grammar*, 554

- Bampton Lectures for 1877*, by Rev. C. A. Row, 236
 Barlow, Bishop, 262
 Barrow on remission of sins, 210
 Barry, Dr., his *Lectures on Masters in English Theology*, 541
 Baynard, Mr. J. B., his *Rector of Oxbury*, 259
 Beck, Dr., translation of his *Outlines of Biblical Psychology*, 553
 Beckett, Sir E., on the Paschal moon, cited, 375
 Bethune, Bishop, 51
 Birks, Dr., his *Bible and Modern Thought and Modern Physical*

CAV

Fatalism and the Doctrine of Evolution, 18

- Blomfield, Bishop, 45, 46
 Bonnier, M., on the secrecy of confession, 209
Boyle Lectures for 1876, by Canon Barry, 549
 Bramston, Mary, her *Em*, 555
 Brooks, Rev. P., his *Lectures on Preaching*, 552
 Broughton, Bishop, 47, 53
 Bucer, Martin, his ordination form. See *Ordination*
 Burials Bill, the abortive legislation of last session, 493 *sq.*; the Dissenters' alleged grievance, 501 *sq.*; Lord Selborne's view, 502 *sq.*; the real end of the agitation, 511; burials of evil-livers, 516; the Church's policy, 518; alternative for the Government, 519 *sq.*

CAMPBELL, Dr. L., his *Sermons on Some Aspects of the Christian Ideal*, 551

- Canons of 1603. See *Revision*
 Canterbury, Archbishop of, on the Burials Bill, 497, 501
 Canterbury, proceedings in Convocation of, 561
 Canterbury Hall, Oxford, Wardens of, 122 *sq.*
 Carlyle, Mr., on Materialism, 15, 16
 Carnarvon, Lord, his publication of Dean Mansel's Lectures, 5, 6; on new Bishoprics, 51
 Cavour: review of M. de Mazade's *Life of Count Cavour*, 326-347; Italy non-existent before Cavour's time, 326; his birth, education, and early career, 327 *sq.*; his

CEY

- newspaper, 328; Victor Emmanuel's accession, 329; Cavour made Prime Minister, 330; his reforms, 330 *sq.*; the Crimean contingent, 331; his treatment of religious bodies, 333; his dealings with Louis Napoleon, 336 *sq.*; the war with Austria, 339 *sq.*; his behaviour towards Garibaldi, 344; his death, 346
- Ceylon, Church affairs in, 566
- Chandler, Prof., 6
- Claughton, Bishop, 57
- Codex Argenteus*, 458
- Coghlan, Rev. W. E., his Sermons on the *Conflict and the Crown*, 551
- Colonial Church (The), 28-67; Colonial charters, 31; religious colonisation, 32 *sq.*; colonial episcopate, 36 *sq.*; missionaries, 37; Australia and Van Diemen's Land, 41 *sq.*, 52, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60; India and Hudson's Bay, 43; the Bishopric of Barbados, 44; Bishop Blomfield's scheme, 45, 46; extension of the Colonial episcopate, 46, 47 *sq.*; missionary bishops, 49; extra-colonial missions, 50 *sq.*, 62; the Canadian Church, 51, 56; Anglican and Roman Catholic Bishops in Australia, 53; New Zealand, 54, 55; Mr. Gladstone's advice, 55; Colonial Synods, 58 *sq.*; Metropolitan, 61 *sq.*; Church of the West Indies, 62, 63; position of the Colonial Churches, 64 *sq.*
- Communion, a French girl's first, 412
- Confession, the recent outcry against, 194 *sq.*; its origin, 196 *sq.*; the Peers' address, 197 *sq.*; the instinct of confession, 199; historical sketch of the law and practice of confession, 200 *sq.*; course of the doctrine in the English Church, 204 *sq.*; conclusions to be deduced, 211; the modern revival, 214 *sq.*; place of confession in the Christian system, 218 *sq.*
- Continental culture, 298-425; its relation to religion, 398 *sq.*; German plans of training, 401 *sq.*; its effects on female servants, 403; training of French girls,

DIS

- 406 *sq.*; Prussian educational establishments, 408 *sq.*; relative effects of the French and German school systems on the national character, 413 *sq.*
- Cooper, Mr. W. R., his *Archaic Dictionary*, 256
- Cornwallis, Archbishop, 195
- Cranmer, Archbishop, 274 *sq.*, 282; his *Catechism* cited, 285
- Craven, Mrs., her *Sister Natalie*, 257
- Crimean war, the, 331, 473 *sq.*
- Crowther, Bishop S., 51
- Cumbræ College, 437 *sq.*
- Cunningham, John, his controversy with Wyclif, 134
- Cunningham, Rev. W., his *A Dissertation on the Epistle of S. Barnabas*, 245
- Cyprian, S., on penitential discipline, 201
- Cyrillus, 458

- DALE, Rev. R. W., his *Nine Lectures on Preaching*, 552
- Daniel Deronda*. See Romance of Modern Scepticism
- Darwinism, Mr. Carlyle on, 15, 16
- De Falloux, Count, his *Life of Augustin Cochin*, 257
- D'Eichthal, M.G., his *Notice sur l'Association pour l'encouragement des Etudes grecques en France*, 545
- Deuteronomy (The Book of) and its Critics, 142-163; Modern school of Biblical critics, 142; reasons for their attack on Deuteronomy, 143 *sq.*; Dr. Kuenen's objections, 144 *sq.*; passages objected to, 146 *sq.*; gravest objections to the Pentateuch, 148 *sq.*; the rationalistic criticisms examined, 149 *sq.*; a popular digest of the Mosaic law, 162
- Deuteronomy, the People's Book*, cited, 148, 150, 153, 155
- Disendowment in Ireland, 190
- Disestablishment, seven years of, in Ireland, 178
- Dissenters, their claims to interment in churchyards. See Burials

EAR

- EARLY MSS. and Miniatures**, review of works, by Prof. Westwood and Count Bastard, illustrating, 448-469; Roman texts and scribes, 451; purpose of illumination, 453; ornamental patterns, 454 *sq.*; epigraphs of old copyists, 455; the Utrecht Psalter, 457; Byzantine art, 458; the MS of Rabula, 460, 462 *sq.*; Irish and Anglo-Saxon ornamentation, 465 *sq.*; the *Book of Kells*, 465, 466
- Easter, Tables in the Book of Common Prayer for finding, 374-398; why Easter is a moveable feast, 375 *sq.*; convenient symbolic formulæ, 394 *sq.*
- Edward VI., Ordinal of, 280
- Elliott, Dr. C., his *Treatise on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*, 553
- English Churchmen on the Continent, 347-374; history of English chaplaincies abroad, 348 *sq.*; appointments of colonial bishops, 356 *sq.*; position of the English Church on the Continent, 365 *sq.*; claims to support, 372 *sq.*
- Epact, the, 386; correction of, 395
- Episcopate, importance of the, 426; the movement for increasing, 559
- Equinox, the vernal, 376 *sq.*
- Estcourt, Canon, his *Question of Anglican Ordination Discussed*. See Ordination
- Evelyn confessing to Jeremy Taylor, 209
- Ewald, his *History of Israel* cited, 144
- Exomologesis, or public confession of sin, 201
- Ewing, Review of the Rev. A. J. Ross's *Memoir of Bishop Ewing*, 425-448; Episcopacy in Scotland, 425 *sq.*; Ewing's Birth, childhood, and education, 426; his marriage, 427; his ordination, 429; his diocesan work, 430; his friendships, 431; his Broad Church views, 432; his action on the Gorham decision, 433; the College at Cumberae, 437 *sq.*; the Eucharist and the Scotch Communion office, 440, 441; his

HOO

- views on future punishment, 443; his letters, 444; the Pan-Anglican Conference, 445 *sq.*; the 'Present Day Papers,' 447; his death, *ib.*

- FEILD**, Bishop, his address to his Synod, 60, 64
- Fichte, on the doctrine of necessity, 14
- Flint, Dr. R., his Baird Lectures on Theism, 550
- Folkestone Ritual Case, review of, 536
- France, the English Church in, 357, 370; peasants and servants in, 405; the *hycle* system in, 413; its effects on the national character, 415
- Fry, the late Canon, 560

- GARIBALDI**, 343 *sq.*
- Germany, school culture in. See Continental Culture
- Gibraltar, Bishops of, 360 *sq.*
- Glynne, Sir S. R., his posthumous *Notes on the Churches of Kent*, 546
- Golden Number, the, 378
- Gorham decision, the, 433
- Goulburn, Mr., on religious contributions, 39
- Grant, Archdeacon, on the growth of the British Colonies, 45
- Granville, Lord, on the Burials Bill, 496, 507
- Gray, Bishop, 49, 355
- Green on the early Irish missionaries, cited, 464

- HAMILTON**, Mr. A. H. A., his translation of Sir John Northcote's *Notebook*, 544
- Haddan, A. W., his *Remains*, cited, 25, 26
- Hamilton, Sir W., axiom of, 11
- Harrowby, Lord, on the Burials Bill, 499, 513
- Hawtreys, Rev. S., his *French Eton*, cited, 413, 414
- Hole, Rev. C., his *Principles of the English Church*, 554
- Hook, Dean, his *Life of Archbishop Langham*, cited, 121

HOO

Hooker on Confession, 204
Hutchings, Rev. W. H., his *Life of Prayer*, 248

INDIA, Church affairs in, 567
Intercalary Day, the, 382
Ireland, Church of, condition and prospects of, 178-193; ecclesiastical buildings, 179-182; glebes, 182 *sq.*; union of benefices, 183 *sq.*; the nomination system, 184-186; revision of the Prayer Book, 186-188; Romish aggression, 188; vital religion and prospects, 188 *sq.*

Irvingites, the, 323
Islip, Simon, his letter to Wyclif, 123, 136
Italy, the kingdom of. *See* Cavour.

JACKSON, Rev. W., his *History of Confirmation*, 249

KALISCH, Dr., his *Bible Studies*, 540
Kant's Philosophy, 7
Keble, Rev. J., offered the Bishopric of Barbados, 44; his *Sermons for the Saints' Days and other Festivals*, 548
Kennedy, Dr. B. Hall, his *Occasional Sermons*, &c. 547
Kindergärten, the German, 401, 402
Kuenen, Dr. A., 144

LANGHAM, Archbishop, 123
Leathes, Rev. Stanley, his *Christian Creed*, 551
Lechler, Dr., his Work on Wyclif, 121
Levant Company, chaplains of, 349 *sq.*
Libri Penitentiales, 205
Liddon, Canon, his Funeral Sermon on Dean Mansel, 19, 27
Llandaff, Bishop of, review of his Inquiry concerning the success of the Evangelical movement of the 18th century, 522
Lubbock, Sir John, cited, 32
Luther on confession, 229

NEW

MACAN, Mr. R. W., his *Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, 241
Macaulay, Lord, his contempt for MS. illumination, 453
Mackenzie, Bishop, 50
Mackenzie, the late Miss Anne, 556
Manning, Cardinal, his *Independence of the Holy See*, 244
Mansel, Dean, as a Christian philosopher, 1-27; his position as a leader of religious thought, 3 *sq.*; his Bampton Lectures, 6 *sq.*; refutation of Kant's philosophy, 7; Rationalism, 8 *sq.*; his scheme of Christian philosophy, 9 *sq.*; the doctrine of necessity, 14 *sq.*; the Materialists, 15 *sq.*; antidote to Positivism, 17; Mr. Mill's criticisms, 18; Mansel's philosophical terms, *ib.*; object of Christian philosophy, 19; Mansel's opponents, 21 *sq.*; philosophy of the conditioned, 24 *sq.*; evidence for his method, 24 *sq.*; conclusion, 27
Mason, his *Vindiciæ Eccl. Ang.* cited, 268
Matheson, Rev. G., his *Growth of the Spirit of Christianity*, 538
Meade, L. T., his *Knight of To-day*, 554
Medd, Rev. P. G., his *Parish Sermons*, 246
Methodists, the, 306 *sq.*
Methodius, 458
Midian, identification of, 158
Mill, Mr., his criticisms on Dean Mansel, 18; his *Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy*, 21
Milligan, Prof., on transcription in ancient times, cited, 451
Miniature, 449; derivation of the term, 454
Moorhouse, Bishop, 57
Mormonism, 325
Mozley, Canon, his sermon on *Eternal Life*, 19, 20
Mullinger, J. Bass, his *Schools of Charles the Great, and the Restoration of Education in the Ninth Century*, 254

NEWCASTLE, Bishop of, address to his diocesan Synod, 59

NEW

- Newman, Dr. J. H., on Arianism, 24, 25; on Anglican orders, 287; his *Via Media of the Anglican Church*, 232
 New Zealand, Church affairs in, 564
 Nohl, Dr., Lady Wallace's translation of his *Life of Mozart*, 543

O'BRIEN, Bishop, his course of Sermons on the *Doctrine of Justification by Faith only*, 549
 Ordination, review of works on the Anglican form of, 261-290; the sentences, 261 *sq.*; Archdeacon Reichel's opinion of their origin, 265 *sq.*; the Ordinal of 1549 and Martin Bucer, 269 *sq.*, 282; the sentences selected for Scriptural reasons, 272, 282; Erasmus's paraphrase, 273 *sq.*; Roman Catholic inconsistency, 276 *sq.*; Canon Estcourt's argument, 278 *sq.*; the sentences defended, 281 *sq.*; comparison with the Roman form, 283; validity of Anglican orders, 287

PAULICIANS, the, 301
 Perowne, Canon, *On Confession in the Church of England*, 231
 Pfeleiderer, Otto, his *Paulinism*, 539
 Phillimore, Sir R., on the origin of churchyards, 505; on the freehold in the fabric and in the churchyard, 506
 Phillpotts, Bishop, on confession and absolution, 198 *sq.*
 Phrontisterion, Dean Mansel's, 6, 15
 Pitra, Cardinal, his *Analecta Sacra Spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, 533
 Plumptre, Dr., his *Popular Exposition of the Epistles of the Seven Churches of Asia*, 553
 Pontifical, the Roman, 264, 284
 Porteus, Bishop, his revival of confession, 195
 Powys, Bishop, death of, 555
 Prayer Book, the new Irish, 186
 Pressensé, Dr. E. D., his *Christian Life and Practice in the Early Church*, 537
 Priest Penitential of the Eastern Christians, 202

SHI

Priesthood, doctrine of, 220
 Prince Consort, review of *Life of the*, 469 *sq.*; historical character of the biography, 470; the Crimean War, 471; the Prince's defence of it, 474 *sq.*; his views on Austrian and Prussian policy, 477 *sq.*; and on the Peace, 480; the Anglo-French alliance, 483; army organisation, 483 *sq.*; the Sebastopol Committee, 488; the Danubian Principalities, 491
 Pusey, Dr., his *Historical Inquiry*, cited, 24

R
RANKE'S History of England, 250
 Rabula, MS. of, 460 *sq.*
 Rawlinson, Canon, his *Origin of Nations*, 546
 Reichel, Archdeacon, his attack on the Ordinal. See Ordination
 Retrospect of 1877
 Revision of the Canons of 1603, 68-9; present state of the ecclesiastical law, 69; the Church of the Reformation, 70; successive groups of Canons, 71; necessity of revision, 72; difficulties, 73 *sq.*; the proposed Code, 74, 75; principles of revision, 76 *sq.*
 Ridsdale case, the decision in the, 558
 Riley, Mr., cited, 127, 128
 Rogers, Mr. H., his Lecture on the *Superhuman Origin of the Bible inferred from itself*, 550
 Romance of Modern Scepticism, review of *Daniel Deronda*, 91-119

S
SAND, George, 115 *sq.*
 Scottish Episcopal Church, life of a Bishop of the. See Ewing
 Sects, number of English, 290
 Selwyn, Bishop, 40, 54 *sq.*, 65
Sermons preached in the Temporary Chapel of Keble College, Oxford, reviewed, 548
 Shairp, his *Lectures on Religion and Culture*, cited, 398
 Shirley, Professor, on the Oxford Notices of Wyclif, 121 *sq.*, 128, 129, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 140

SHO

- Short, Bishop, on the General Synod of Australia, 61
 Shuttleworth, Bishop, his *Not Tradition, but Scripture*, 247
 Shuttleworth, the late Sir J. K., 557
 Smith, Rev. J. N., on the determination of Easter, 375, 381
Spouse of Christ, the, 317
 Sunday Letter, the, 381
 Spencer, Mr. H., 15
 Spiritual claims of the Church of England, review of works concerning, 290-325; number of English sects, 290 *sq.*; pre-eminence of the Church, 292 *sq.*, 325; tests of the True Church, 296 *sq.*; the case against the Dissenters, 298 *sq.*; the case for the Church, 307 *sq.*; her relation to the Roman Church, 310 *sq.*; summary of her characteristics, 325
 Stobart, Mr. J. W. H., his *Non-Christian Religious Systems*, 256
 Swedenborgians, the, 324

- TAIT, Bishop, 49
 Taylor, Mr. C., his *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 246
 Taylor, Jeremy, 209
 Theodorus, Archbishop, *Penitential* of, 205
 Thiers, the late M., 557
 Thirlwall, Bishop, Canon Perowne's edition of his *Remains*, 535
 Through Nature to Christ: review of Dr. Abbott's work, 164-178; design of the book 164, 165; universal desire for worship, 166; Positivism, 167 *sq.*; education through illusion, 168 *sq.*; the worship of Christ, 172 *sq.*; human aspect of Christ's life, 176 *sq.*
 Tooth, Mr., 558, 560

- UTRECHT Psalter, the, 457

YOR

- VALIN, Abbé, *De l'Ultramontanisme et du Gallicisme*, 253
 Vatican Council, the, 320
 Victor Emmanuel, 329 *sq.*

- WADDING, his *Annales Minorum*, cited, 137
 Wake, Archbishop, 197
 Waldenses, the, 302
 Weld, Rev. A., his *Suppression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions*, 255
 West, Rev. J. R., his *Sermons on the Holy Eucharist*, 248
 West Indies, Church affairs in, 565
 Williams, Prof. Monier, his *Hinduism*, 256
 Willis, Dr. R., his *Servetus and Calvin*, 542
 Wilson, Rev. H. B., anecdote concerning, 431
 Winslow, Dr. Forbes, his *Spiritualistic Madness*, 249
 Wirgman, Rev. A. T., *The Prayer-Book*, by, 249
 Wodeford, William, 137
 Wyclif, John, at Oxford, 119-141; controversies as to his life at the University, 120 *sq.*; notices of Canterbury Hall, 122 *sq.*; Wyclif's appeal to the Pope, 123; legal proceedings, 124; Royal award, 124, 125; further Oxford notices, 126 *sq.*; his ejection from Canterbury Hall, 131; his attacks on the Church's doctrine, 131 *sq.*; his controversy with Cunningham, 134; his *Theory of Dominion*, *ib.*; his work *De Ecclesiâ*, 135; evidence of W. Wodeford, 136 *sq.*; Oxford in the thirteenth century, 139; conclusions, 140 *sq.*

- YORK, Archbishop of, on the Burials Bill, 498

